

VOLUME XI

MARCH-APRIL, 1925

NUMBER 3-4

378.05

As  
A8B

cop. 2

# BULLETIN

OF

## THE AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF UNIVERSITY PROFESSORS

EDUCATIONAL DISCUSSION  
PRESIDENTIAL ADDRESSES AND REPORTS  
COMMITTEES FOR 1925

PUBLISHED BY  
THE AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF UNIVERSITY PROFESSORS  
225 CHURCH STREET, EASTON, PA.  
EDITORIAL OFFICE, 222 CHARLES RIVER ROAD  
CAMBRIDGE  
BOSTON, MASSACHUSETTS

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

### General Announcements

American Council on Education.....	143
Association of American Colleges, The College Curriculum..	143
League of Nations, International University Information....	146
College Entrance Examination Board.....	146
British Association of University Teachers.....	148
Examinations—The School Leaving Certificate.....	150
Netherlands Committee for International Academic Relations.....	152
Commonwealth Fund Fellowships.....	153
Guggenheim Fellowships.....	153

### Educational Discussion

Tendencies in Professional Education, <i>N. P. Colwell, S. P. Capen</i> .....	154
President Neilson and Committee T.....	156
How to Maintain Standards without Excessive Standardization, <i>R. L. Wilbur, F. J. E. Woodbridge</i> .....	166
The Place of Religion in Higher Education in America, <i>C. A. Richmond</i> .....	172
The University's Intellectual Responsibility, <i>H. W. Chase</i> ...	174
A Department of Education, <i>J. H. MacCracken</i> .....	176
Brief Notes.....	177

### Presidential Addresses and Reports

Amherst, Inaugural Address, <i>G. D. Olds</i> .....	178
Buffalo, Report of the Chancellor.....	182
Chicago, Convocation Addresses.....	184
Columbia, Annual Reports.....	186
Vassar, Report of the President.....	192

### Local and Chapter Notes

Colorado School of Mines.....	198
Dartmouth, Fraternity Pledging.....	198
Maryland, Student Dismissal.....	199
Michigan, Requirements for Appointment and Promotion...	200
Northwestern, A Survey Program.....	200
Washington, Chapter Activity.....	201

Committees for 1925.....	202
--------------------------	-----

### Membership

Members Elected.....	208
Nominations for Membership.....	210

gift  
Prof. E. C. Case  
5-4-28

## GENERAL ANNOUNCEMENTS

AMERICAN COUNCIL ON EDUCATION.—At a meeting of the Executive Committee held February 28, the officers reported a considerable expansion of the Register of the Personnel Division, which now contains 25,000 to 30,000 cards. In spite of the great expense which the maintenance of the Register now imposes on the Council, it was the sense of the Executive Committee that every effort should be made to continue the Register substantially along the present lines, enlisting outside financial support if possible.

A second matter of importance was the question of publishing an American Universities Yearbook, which it is hoped the Council will be in a position to undertake in the near future. It will be recalled that such an undertaking was seriously considered by this Association soon after its organization and that a committee was appointed to study and report on the problem but considered the expense prohibitive.

The Assistant Director of the Council made an extended and interesting report on numerous international matters including the classification of Oriental and Latin-American institutions, the reports from the University Union offices in London and Paris, the Commonwealth and Guggenheim Fellowships, the plan for a students' international union in Geneva, and progress in promoting educational relations with other countries in many parts of the world.

The annual meeting of the Council will be held at Washington, May 1 and 2.

*University Union.*—An informal report from the London Director gives an account of the organization of a British-American Association of Phi Beta Kappa, with the Earl of Balfour as President, aiming to put the ideals of Fraternity, Morality and Literature in practical effect by drawing into close cooperation the Phi Beta Kappa scholars in Great Britain and America. At least one meeting of the Association is to be held in London each year on a date as near as may be convenient to December 4th. The Director in Paris reports on a visit to provincial universities and mentions his appointment to represent the United States at the Commission of the League of Nations for International Intellectual Cooperation at sessions in Paris beginning February 16.

ASSOCIATION OF AMERICAN COLLEGES. REPORT OF THE COMMISSION ON THE COLLEGE CURRICULUM.—“Briefly, then, the entering students presented more English, mathematics, and foreign languages, and

much more history and science than were either prescribed or recommended, and in order to do this took but an eighth of the options allowed them in other subjects.

"The entrance requirement chosen by 15,000 students in 94 different institutions during twelve of the last twenty years is thus 4.5 units in foreign languages, 3.5 in English, 3 in mathematics, 2 in history, 1.5 in science, and but 0.5 of a unit in other subjects.

"Chronologically, while the colleges have allowed increasing flexibility and freedom in their requirements for entrance, the entering students have concentrated on the subjects that have been traditionally considered standard and fundamental. . .

"In brief, the characteristic curriculum may be said to divide four years of 120 semester hours into prescriptions of 12.5 hours in foreign languages, 9 in English, 8 in science, 4.5 in mathematics, 4.5 in history, 2 in philosophy and psychology, and 5 in other subjects, a total prescription of 45.5 hours, or one and one-half year's work. About one year of work in addition, 35.5 hours, is recommended in the form of major, minor, group, or elective subjects. The remainder, 39 hours, or a year and a third of work, or somewhat less than that prescribed, is left free for the student's choice of anything that is available in the institution. . .

"In general, therefore, while the prescription and recommendation of specific subjects for the bachelor's degree grew more flexible, the concentration of the students on the half dozen subjects that have been traditionally considered standard and fundamental changed but little, so that in response to a prescription of such subjects for one-third of their college work, 34 per cent, students devoted seven-eighths, 87 per cent, of their time to them.

"The general result of these eleven studies is therefore the indication that—(1) as colleges have grown more liberal in their requirements for entrance and graduation, their students have remained conservative in their choice of subjects, offering an increasing excess over the requirements in these subjects; (2) the belief of secondary schools that requirements for entrance to college are too rigid does not appear to be confirmed by the fact that students took advantage of but a small part of the freedom allowed them; and (3) the extended array of major, minor, group, alternative, and elective subjects provided by the colleges has not attracted their students nearly so much as the subjects that have been traditionally considered standard and fundamental."



The following extracts are quoted from the program of the eleventh Annual meeting of the Association.

*Unity in the Curriculum.*—The Association of American Colleges has made a number of studies of educational programs on the basis of *entrance requirements, graduation requirements, proportion of students enrolled in each department, excess of semester hours earned over semester hours required*, and similar devices for understanding the present status of the course of study in the liberal arts college. None of these studies concerned itself with the individual student.

"In 1923 a letter was sent to the colleges asking for 'statement of the curriculum of one or more of your recent graduates, showing exactly how he was led to pursue a unified course of study. . .,' and explaining further that the statement should 'show how college work was built on secondary work and how the work progressed each year so that at the end of his course the student had a fair comprehension of the general field of knowledge and a definite mastery of some subject or subjects.'

"Replies from forty-six colleges located in twenty-four states afford one hundred and ten curricula. Our correspondents were not asked to give their definition of unity nor was any definition furnished them. It must be confessed that the results of this study are in some cases difficult to interpret. . .

"It appears that whatever conception of unity our correspondents may have had in mind, the personality of the students reported bulked large in the minds of most of them. If there is unity at all in some of these cases, it is unity through personality—certainly not through subject-matter, and only in a limited field through method. Perhaps the student had within himself unusual powers of synthesis. There may not have been conscious effort at unity on the part of the curriculum makers. . .

"It is a striking fact that a very large proportion of the work done in the college curriculum is of secondary grade, *i.e.*, work in the first and second years of foreign languages, general courses in principles of the sciences, etc. . .

"If the values of this study are largely negative, it is hoped that it may at least illustrate concretely some of the dangers of our present régime of mass production in the college."

*Bulletins*, Association of American Colleges, May and Dec., 1924.

LEAGUE OF NATIONS. BULLETIN OF INTERNATIONAL UNIVERSITY INFORMATION.—The January number contains articles on Physical Research in the United States, on the American Library in Paris, and on the Paris Office of the American University Union; communications from Universities in different parts of the world, from the International Federation of University Women, and the World Students' Christian Federation. An account is given of the first international congress in Byzantine studies at Bucarest.

COLLEGE ENTRANCE EXAMINATION BOARD.—The twenty-fourth Annual Report of the Secretary discusses the influence of the Board for close coordination and sound conditions in education as follows:

"For a quarter of a century the College Entrance Examination Board has striven to promote the welfare of the secondary schools as well as that of the colleges. Standing at the point of contact of secondary school and college, the point most important strategically in the educational system of the nation, it has rendered a service of inestimable value in promoting closer coordination and higher standards. The task to which it has directly addressed itself has been to ascertain in regard to the boys and girls applying for admission to college not merely whether they have stored in their memories the material compiled in their textbooks or presented to them by earnest teachers, but primarily whether they have really made a start, have actually gone a little distance, on the road from childhood to intellectual maturity. With an ever-widening sphere of influence the Board has been able to continue its efforts without interruption and to retain the confidence of the institutions most vitally concerned in its work. There have been no sudden reversals or radical changes in its policies. On the contrary, its progress has been historical and logical.

*"Qualities Tested by the Board's Examinations.*—Up to the present time the examinations of the College Entrance Examination Board have been, above all, a test of the following qualities:

- (1) Power of expression
- (2) Intelligent appreciation
- (3) Ability to reassemble information
- (4) Courage to form and express independent judgments
- (5) Concentration, or power to sustain a mental effort.

The Board has at all times accepted the principle that it was its province to test the individual candidates only in respect to certain

clearly defined abilities or acquirements, leaving it to the several universities, colleges, and scientific schools immediately concerned to administer such supplementary tests as should seem to them necessary or desirable.

"Among the qualities in regard to which many colleges desire information and for which direct tests exist, although the Board has not as yet undertaken to administer such tests, are the following:

- (1) Ethical behavior
- (2) Physical health
- (3) Powers of observation
- (4) Mental alertness
- (5) Ability to participate successfully in cooperative efforts, or team work
- (6) Skill in laboratory work
- (7) Facility in conversation in foreign languages.

"Attention should be called to the fact that almost all of the colleges participating in the work of the College Entrance Examination Board consider the record of the candidate in the secondary school as evidence of great importance, in fact, as well nigh indispensable if a fair verdict is to be rendered in a case in which there is doubt in regard to the fitness of a candidate for admission."

The number of candidates examined in September at those institutions using the Board examinations at that time was 3535.

"Among measures that have been suggested for the purpose of lessening the fluctuations in the results of the Board's examinations it is worth while, perhaps, to mention the following:

- (1) Material increase in the number of questions asked at an examination
- (2) Better distribution of the questions over the whole field covered by the requirement
- (3) Exclusive use of questions previously tried out by experiments in secondary schools.

Another form of the last suggestion is the proposal that each group of examiners draw its examination questions from a reservoir consisting of several thousand questions all of which have been tested by experiments in the secondary schools. "In a number of subjects undoubtedly the problem of lessening the fluctuations in the results of the examinations would be solved most simply and most effectively by adopting more detailed and more precise definitions of the requirements and by setting examinations strictly conforming thereto."

The candidates of 1924 came from 1655 schools, of which 599 sent only a single candidate each.

Arrangements have been made for future examinations in Italian, and action has been taken looking to the introduction of psychological tests.

Of the 19,362 candidates, nearly 13,000 were boys; 17,000 took the old plan examinations; not quite 6000 came from the public schools. The total expense per candidate was \$8.86. Six hundred and seven persons participated in the reading of June examinations.

BRITISH ASSOCIATION OF UNIVERSITY TEACHERS. *The President's Address.*—"It is true to say that when we left the war behind we also left behind the old particularism. That is over with the nightmare episode which destroyed it. We have entered upon a new era.

"One of the indications of the new consciousness was the appearance of this our Association of University Teachers. Here were manifested at least the beginnings of a perception of a common purpose and a common interest. A further phase of integration was in process. And it is desirable here to recognize that it was an expression of what we call the logic of events. It was not an arbitrary creation of restless and fanciful minds; it was an inevitable (as it was a happy) occurrence.

"It is true that self-consciousness is not a wholly happy state. It brings new inspiration, it also involves new tasks and burdens and we must not be surprised if there be some who are uneasy and irritable at its advent. They cast a wistful eye upon the Eden of our former simplicity. They would like to believe that these things have not happened. Our friends and critics—they are not remarkably numerous, but they exist—are not necessarily dull reactionaries. They may be immersed in their chosen branch of science or learning and in the work of their own university departments. That is wholly honorable. It seems to me that it is the first duty of a university teacher to try, whole-heartedly and with his best powers, to perform the special function for which he has been chosen. But, in my view, though it is his first, it is not his last duty. And his refusal to look beyond it is based on a failure to apprehend the truth which may be, and generally is, contained in a platitude. In this case, the platitude is that the power of each of us is as the strength of the whole.

"I do not despise altruism, but, altruism apart, and merely on the grounds of an enlightened self-interest, I regard it as well worth

while to join hands with colleagues all over the country for the purpose of bringing about a situation in which the individual may be able, with the minimum of hindrance, to do the best he has it in him to do. I should therefore be happy to see all men of enterprise and good-will in the universities actively furthering the purposes of this Association, believing, as I do, that they would, personally, be hitching their wagon to a star, as well as adding to their power of serving their country and their age. . .

"What can we not do, if we think together, act together in the spirit I have indicated? I do not mean by squandering effort in the confused field of general politics, but by concentrating upon our own special group of problems. And this is no hole-in-corner business. It is central and vital. It is no extravagance to claim that the universities constitute an integral part of the brain of the nation. The fluctuations in its health and vigor must be felt to the remotest parts of the body politic. How is this portion of the nation's brain constituted? What are the elements with which this living tissue is built up? They are the lives of the men and women devoted to the accomplishment of the university's tasks—to the development and discipline of the best talent in the youth of the nation, those who are to be its guides in thought, its leaders in action in the next generation; to the continuous, disinterested but not unimpassioned extension of the boundaries of knowledge. It is these men and women, carefully selected, constantly immersed in the problems of their life work living close to them day by day and coming to have an almost intuitive sense of their relative value and importance who of necessity determine the destiny of the universities. It is in the measure in which they clearly apprehend their responsibilities and loyally discharge them that the universities will flourish or decay. And this—you must pardon me if I return upon my refrain—is not a mere matter of professional interest and *amour propre*; it is fateful for the whole of society. Surely then it is wisdom's part and a plain duty to come together, to fund our experience and the insight born of that experience, in order that we may help and inspire each other, in order that we may preserve fresh and bright the sense of our great problem and unitedly work towards its better solution. If the Association of University Teachers had not come naturally into being at the proper evolutionary moment, it would have had to be invented. . .

"We do not entertain the foolish idea of usurping the functions of any of these local bodies. It is far from us, as it is from the thoughts



of any one in his senses, to suggest, say, the usurping by Senate of the functions of faculties. The analogy does not go all the way, for, of course, a Senate can, and does, on occasion—though rarely, if it be wise—executively over-ride the decisions of faculties. We prize too much the freedom and elasticity which the autonomy of the universities brings, to dream of carrying the analogy to that point. Nevertheless we must take our courage in our hands and, even at the risk of putting a strain upon the constitution of some of our colleagues, venture to speak of our Association as the Assizes or—to avoid the sinister implications of that word—the general Council of the Universities. There we may hope to focus all questions affecting not merely a particular university, as such, but the system as a whole, and endeavor to come to a collective judgment upon them. This is not an idle and 'academic' aspiration. We can, it is true, bring into action no executive sanctions, save that of the intrinsic and reasonable worth of our verdicts, but I do not despair of human intelligence to the point of thinking that such a sanction would be empty and inoperative. . .

"I wish to give myself the personal pleasure of greeting, for myself and for you, the great kindred Association of the United States, with which we are in relation, by means of exchange of publications, for example, much to the profit of our Association, at least. . .

"I have not been consciously making an appeal so much as expounding a situation. But I may be permitted at the end of it all to say this: If there should still be in any quarter a disposition to regard adherence to this Association as somehow impairing the dignity of a university teacher, I trust it may soon disappear. The Association dignifies and exalts our office by placing it in a wider context and making plain to us its far-reaching influence. It takes us out of ourselves, puts us in closer contact not only with all engaged in the same task but also with our fellow-countrymen throughout the land. It binds us together in a great and impersonal effort for a great cause. To all generous minds of any imagination and goodwill it must make a powerful call. What has been achieved in the five years of our existence should give us satisfaction and confidence. But we are, as yet, comparatively, on the threshold of our career."

ALEXANDER MAIR, *University Bulletin*, December, 1924.

EXAMINATIONS—THE SCHOOL LEAVING CERTIFICATE.—"It is doubtful whether Socrates had the English University Entrance



Examination in mind when he said that 'the unexamined life is no life for a man.' He would, we imagine, have admitted that in an ideal world the best work is done for its own sake and might perchance even have subscribed to the humorous remark Mr. Hartog once made that 'culture may be killed but cannot be caught by examinations.' Be this as it may, nobody has as yet found a satisfactory substitute for them, and whether for good or ill the examination system is with us and will have to serve until life itself provides the final test. It is equally true that although they afford a certain stimulus they fail to give satisfaction to teachers and examiners—candidates I dare not ask. There is a fairly general feeling in the land that they have been moulded by a purely empirical tradition, that they are continually being altered and patched up by mischievous pedagogic quacks in a futile attempt to adapt them to the conditions of modern life. We must indeed confess that their growth has not been organic. Although we do not aim so much at studying the origin of their defects as at clearly defining these and suggesting possible remedies, the two points cannot be envisaged separately. . .

"If one bears in mind that the knowledge a student may amass during his school years will at best amount to an infinitesimal fraction of what is obtainable and that by the time he is twenty-five he will probably have forgotten most of what has been taught him, it becomes evident that the acquisition of knowledge is not and cannot be the ultimate end of education. The aim then is to give intellectual and moral training, to give sound mental habits, not to 'furnish' the mind, and it may be embodied in a very short and simple formula: the best preparation for life. Education must enable the student to earn his living in the best possible way by developing his power of assimilation, by stimulating his intellectual activity and creative faculty so as to produce in the nation an *élite* capable of fulfilling all the different functions which are essential to a democracy in industry, commerce, administration, progress in science, art and literature. It must have a solid basis—a realistic character, must teach him to observe and verify; but in order to avoid the danger of a material outlook must also be philosophical, teach him to understand and sympathize. It must introduce the future citizen not merely to the physical structure of the world in which he lives but also to the deeper interest and problems of politics, thought and human life. There is not a minute in a man's life when those faculties are not needed, when they will not favorably affect the happiness of the individual,

the community, and, in the widest sense, the prosperity of the country. . .

"If the proper allowances are made for unavoidable broad generalization, one may say that examiners seem to have been actuated by the following motives:

- (a) a desire to search the whole range of the candidate's knowledge
- (b) a desire to give him every reasonable chance
- (c) a desire to eliminate, as far as possible the element of luck, by which I naturally mean 'bad' luck.

Now these very laudable motives have determined the nature and length of examination papers, and the results have been far from satisfactory. In the papers set upon subjects which I have any claim to understand I have often been struck by the lack of questions testing the candidate's power of original thought. This, and I will limit myself to one point, is often because the number of questions asked is far too great for the time allowed. The bewildered boy (or girl) has no time for thinking; write he must; and in consequence his short three hours are consumed by a frantic effort to remember. He has no time for collecting his thoughts, for fruitful meditation, for choosing his material by process of elimination. He has no time for marshalling his thoughts in the most effective way or for nicely adjusting his expressions to his thought. In fact, he has no opportunity of applying the most elementary rules to the art of thinking and writing. The answers are too often sketchy, superficial, slipshod, when not entirely irrelevant, or reproducing matter actually learnt by heart though not necessarily digested. We seem to wish to find out not what the candidate can do with what he knows, how far he is capable of applying his knowledge to further problems, but simply how much, or rather how fast, he can remember what he has been taught."

F. BOILLOT, in the *University Bulletin*, December, 1924.

NETHERLANDS COMMITTEE FOR INTERNATIONAL ACADEMIC RELATIONS.—The Committee has published an attractive guide book for foreign students in Holland (obtainable from the Committee's Office, 33 Wasstraat, Leyden) giving condensed practical information in regard to the conditions for admission and examination, the curriculum and degrees of the Dutch universities and institutions for scientific research.

**COMMONWEALTH FUND FELLOWSHIPS.**—These are open to graduates of British universities for study in the United States. Twenty appointments are made each year for two years. The amount of the Fellowship is approximately \$3000 each year. Candidates may be of either sex, unmarried and under thirty years of age. They may attend any institution in the Association of American Universities, but not more than three in the same institution in any one year. The British Committee of Awards acts under the general direction of the trustees of the Commonwealth Fund.

**GUGGENHEIM FELLOWSHIPS.**—The Guggenheim Fellowships provide for older students or young professors on sabbatical leave, desiring to study in any country. The amount is approximately \$2500 a year, and it is expected that forty to fifty Fellows will be continuously maintained. The chairman of the Educational Advisory Board is President Frank Aydelotte of Swarthmore; the Secretary, Mr. Henry Allen Moe, 2300 Pershing Square, New York City.

## EDUCATIONAL DISCUSSION

TENDENCIES IN PROFESSIONAL EDUCATION.—In connection with the publication in the October, 1924, *Bulletin*, of an article by Chancellor Capen on "Tendencies in Professional Education," the following letter has been received from Dr. N. P. Colwell, Secretary of the Council on Medical Education and Hospitals, of the American Medical Association. It is followed by a comment by Dr. Capen.

"I have read with interest the article on 'Tendencies in Professional Education,' in the *Bulletin* for October, 1924, on pages 35 to 39 inclusive. Like other standardizing bodies the Council on Medical Education has 'refrained from designating the content of courses of instruction' in fields which were not distinctly that of medical education. Indeed, from the beginning of its work the Council has repeatedly emphasized the fact that such standards as it issued were suggestive and were not to be looked upon as absolute requirements.

"Dr. Capen states further, in reference to the Council on Medical Education, 'that a professional body outside of the university has usurped the function of the university in defining a course of study' which is not for the professional school but is 'in a division of the university with the problems and purposes of which the professional advisers cannot be familiar.' Dr. Capen doubtless refers to the subjects suggested for the two-year pre-medical college course. The Council took particular pains to select on that committee, men who were in position to fully appreciate 'the problems and purposes' of college education. The chairman selected for that committee was no other than Dr. Kendric C. Babcock, who preceded Dr. Capen as Expert in Higher Education of the United States Bureau of Education and who represented on the committee the North Central Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools. Another member of the committee was Dr. George Gailey Chambers, examiner of the University of Pennsylvania, who also represented the Association of American Universities. A third member of the committee was Dr. Theodore Hough (Ph.D.) a man of high standing in university education even though he happened to be the dean of the University of Virginia Medical Department. Where, indeed, could the Council find better advisers in the problems relating to college education than the three just named?

"The matter in which the Council exerted the utmost caution was to refrain from either suggesting or dictating any standards without

first securing the advice of those most able to speak with authority in the educational fields dealt with.

Very truly yours,

N. P. COLWELL, *Secretary*,  
Council on Medical Education and Hospitals."

"I appreciate your kindness in showing me Dr. Colwell's comment on my article entitled, 'Tendencies in Professional Education.' It does not seem to me to bear directly on the points which I tried to make. The purpose of my paper was to point out the total effect on universities of the accumulating standards and prescriptions imposed by outside professional organizations. I tried to show how finally the universities may lose control of their own enterprises in the field of professional education and how they may be prevented from fruitful experimentation. My commendation of the work of the Council on Medical Education was, I should have supposed, wholehearted enough to have satisfied anybody. Its work has been extraordinarily beneficial and I belong among its enthusiastic admirers.

"But it is possible for even the Council on Medical Education to make mistakes. My private judgment is that it made one when it prescribed the pre-medical curriculum. The fact that it got the best expert advice in the field of college education when it drafted the curriculum does not alter the case. The mistake was in prescribing the curriculum at all. The prescription has two evil effects. First, it prevents any institution from making a thorough-going experiment in the reorganization of the content of medical training. If a faculty imbued with the experimental spirit and familiar with modern psychology and pedagogy should desire to organize the best possible course of training for medicine covering a period of six years, is it to be supposed that they would follow the arrangement of content now prevalent in the combined pre-medical and medical curricula? No one for a moment believes so. There would undoubtedly be a completely different arrangement of subjects. The work of the medical school and of the pre-medical years would be far more completely fused. Perhaps the medical student would not cut loose from the college entirely at the end of his sophomore year. Certainly he would be introduced earlier to simple practical professional work. But no faculty is free to undertake such an experiment now. And the principal obstacle is the prescription of the pre-medical course. (In my paper, however, I alluded to another obstacle also.)



"The second evil result of the prescription is the influence which it has had and will continue to have on the development of arts college education. The problems of liberal arts education are extraordinarily puzzling. It cannot be presumed that any professional organization will be greatly exercised over them. Certainly no professional body, no matter how well advised it may be—and the Council on Medical Education secured the best advice there was—is likely to contribute anything very useful to their solution by imposing upon the liberal arts college a cut and dried task to perform. I do not think any professional body has a right to do this. And if other professional bodies attempt to follow the example of the Council on Medical Education in this direction, without full preliminary consultation with the college interests, the effect on the colleges is likely to be very unfortunate. The universities will lose all effective jurisdiction over collegiate education as well as over professional education. But after all this is what I tried to say in my paper. I will not repeat it here.

Sincerely yours,  
S. P. CAPEN."

PRESIDENT NEILSON AND COMMITTEE T.—In his presidential address<sup>1</sup> before the Modern Language Association, President Neilson spoke in part as follows:

"The supreme task of the executive in the American college and university is that of the selection of staff. The thousand and one other concerns in which he must engage, from finance to drainage and from handling of parents and alumni to dormitory architecture and theories of the curriculum, are negligible in comparison with the choice of the men and women on whom finally depends the success of his institution in the accomplishment of the main task of education. In this business of selection one of the first issues is the question of preference between the teacher and the scholar. It is commonly agreed that for undergraduates the prime requisite is teaching power, for graduates, erudition; and, perhaps, with the qualifications that will occur to every one, we may let this pass. But undergraduates are much more numerous than graduate students, and good teachers are probably rarer than good scholars. Yet our advanced instruction is planned mainly for the production of scholars, hardly at all for the training of teachers. This has long been recognized, yet nothing is done about it. . .

<sup>1</sup> Proceedings of the Modern Languages Association, March, 1925.



"When this problem is viewed from the point of view of the individual instructor, it may take the form of the question as to whether he is more interested in the subject or in the pupil. There is, of course, much to be said for a teacher's having abounding enthusiasm for his subject and little good is to be expected without it. But such enthusiasm is not incompatible with some consideration of the general task before us. The problem of the undergraduate college is not merely that of providing abundance of the waters of learning, it is also that of inducing those who are led or driven thither to drink. This requires skill in presentation, power of evoking curiosity, and not merely enthusiasm but a contagious enthusiasm. These seem to be possessed by only a minority of the men and women who regard themselves as prepared for college teaching; and if they are candid with themselves they find it out sooner or later. If later, they probably think they cannot afford to do anything about it, or think that nothing can be done about it. I presume the majority of my hearers believe that the teacher is as definitely 'born not made' as the poet, and are even now preparing to resist a plea for pedagogy with all the ancient weapons of our most prejudiced profession. I am not going to make any such plea. I wish only to urge upon your attention the serious nature of the problem involved in the absence of practical skill in so large a proportion of college teachers. Apart from what is commonly called professional training, I have come to believe in the importance of two factors that, viewed properly, might help to improve the situation. I have found, first, that many—not all—poor teachers are so because their whole intellectual life is sluggish. It is only rarely that a man who is actively getting and giving in the intellectual interchange of the college community is dull in the class room. His teaching may be lopsided, but his pupils are likely to get something for their money, and his colleagues are the better for his fellowship. I really mean, of course, *intellectual* interchange: not the interchange of anecdote at the club. A faculty can go far without scientific pedagogy if it lives in an atmosphere friendly to ideas, friendly to the curiosity that seeks to extract the meaning from events, ancient, medieval, or contemporary.

"I have found, secondly, that the solution of the larger educational problems is terribly hampered by departmentalism. I need no more striking instance of this than that which I contemplate on looking back at my own unregenerate past. For twenty years I sat and voted on college and university faculties, and in the presence of con-

troversial issues hardly raised my eyes beyond the horizons of the department of English. I should probably never have found out had not fate suddenly placed me where my duties made me realize my all but complete innocence of any thought-out scheme or policy, any well-considered general ideas on what the whole business of college education was about. And now as hesitatingly I seek to arrive at such ideas and present them to my colleagues, I find myself faced from without, as previously unconsciously from within, by the instinct to defend the chosen subject, to guard the interests of the single department, to support the measures that will bring it the maximum of equipment, of enrollment, of prestige. Such partisanship, of course, hinders educational progress in general; but it also lessens the teaching effectiveness of the partisan, who could not but teach better if he saw the problem involved not only as the exposition, say, of French idiom, but in the mental development of each student before him. It reminds me of certain country roads I have travelled in the foothills of the Black Forest where the use of centuries has sunk them far below the level of the surrounding fields, and where the wayfarer may walk through the midst of beautiful prospects, yet be unable to see over the embankments which hem him in. Loyalty to one's own branch of learning is, of course, commendable; but like all provincial patriotisms, it is apt if uncontrolled to be at war with the larger interests of the race.

"The teacher of the type I have been describing usually believes he has, and indeed does have, certain educational fundamentals which determine his attitude and vote on general questions of policy; but he seldom realizes the assumption which underlies these principles. This is usually one of two. The commoner is the assumption that the educational system which produced him must have been a pretty good system. The rarer—rarer because humility is rarer than arrogance—is that the educational system which produced him, and left him with so much to do for himself later, must have been pretty bad. In other words, while we have no educational science, we have a dominant educational superstition. Our tests are subjective tests...

"Let us turn now from the field of teaching to that of scholarship.

"The ideal motive of scholarship is love of truth. It is based on the faith that truth is one of the supreme and final aims of humanity, that human welfare depends on our whole-hearted allegiance to it, that the humblest discoverer of new truth is aiding, however infinitesimally, in the onward march.

"But human nature seldom moves long in the rare atmosphere of these uplands. The motives more frequently in force among working scholars, the motives which keep a man at it day after day, vacation after vacation, are apt to be an insatiable curiosity without after-thought, or the desire for light on a practical problem, or the sheer love of the game. Admirable motives all of them, and I should be glad to think that they sufficiently accounted for the research attempted in our profession. Were we left to ourselves, they probably would.

"The Presidents, however, have intruded. They discovered that their institutions gained glory from the publications of the results of research by the members of the faculties, and that to encourage research helped to keep up the intellectual vitality of the place. So the process began which is called 'putting on pressure to produce.' Advancement was often made to depend on publication, and on quantity rather than quality, and a number of evils with which we have long been familiar resulted. As I see it now, the great mass of non-significant so-called learned publication is due less to the stupidity or vain glory on the part of the scholar, than to unintelligent and indiscriminating pressure from the administration. Just as for a period the possession of a Ph.D. degree was made an indispensable qualification for a position in many colleges, on the assumption that thereby a scholarly faculty could be assembled, so some seem to have supposed that they could be kept up to standard by insisting on the frequent publication of research.

"Associated with this tendency was another—to value contributions to learning in proportion to their dryness, their unintelligibility, or their remoteness from human interest. This is a natural result of the gullibility of presidents, who, being, like all of us, only partially educated, are incapable of expert judgment in many fields. Unfortunately the effect of over-appreciation in one direction has been depreciation in the other. It has led to the regarding lightly of contributions capable of being understood by the common man, to suspicion of the larger curiosity which leads to generalisation, and to the branding of any approach to pure literature as 'belletristic' and unacademic.

"Here we return to the unfortunate condition I have already discussed, the failure to recognize the man capable of stimulating the intelligence of those he comes in contact with, whether students or colleagues, as more important than the merely productive scholar,

and not without value even in graduate and professional schools. . .

"I wish now to discuss some questions on the relations of the Faculty to the Administration and the Trustees.

"The American Association of University Professors has published a valuable report on 'The Status of Faculties in University Government.' For this Association I have profound respect. It has investigated a considerable number of cases of abuse of power in American Universities and colleges, and by its thoroughness, fairness, and insight has been able to render verdicts which have, as far as I know, always commanded general assent. It is probably unaware that the effect of these investigations has extended far beyond the institutions in question, that it now prevents more than it cures, since for members of my branch of the profession its tribunal has largely taken the place of the Last Judgment. I was a member of this Association from its beginning until I was evicted upon accepting my present position. I think the rule that led to my eviction is an unfortunate one. Presidents and Deans, were they permitted to be members, would always be in a small minority, and I cannot think so poorly of them or of Professors as to believe that their presence would stifle free discussion. They could learn much, and what they learned would undoubtedly conduce to a growth in humility. And they could contribute something. It is because I am not allowed to contribute at their meetings that I am abusing, as you see, my present opportunity.

"It is a mistake to model an organization of University professors on the trade-union. The attitude of the trade-union is due mainly to the fact that it is a defensive association of wage-earners against a body of profit-takers. The fact that University Trustees and Presidents get no profits disables the comparison with the industrial situation. And even in industry the hopeful movement is towards common councils, not one-sided bodies.

"The report on 'The Status of Faculties in University Government' is a moderate and balanced document, much less biased in the direction of the indefinite extension of Faculty control than many of the discussions which preceded it. Yet its tendency is on the whole toward greater Faculty control; and it is because I have come to doubt the benefit of this in many respects for the institution and the Professors themselves that I am going to consider some of its recommendations and observations.

"First, as to Trustees, I select these two sentences from the first section: 'It is a somewhat rare thing to find on a board a representa-

tive of either the teaching profession or scientific research. Still rarer to find a representative of the industrial workers! Now I have seen the experiment tried of having a professor from another institution on a Board, and the result was to bring out very clearly the fact that colleges compete with one another—for professors, for general and special endowments, for priority in educational innovations. A general extension of the practice would be likely, in my opinion, to lead to unfortunate complications. As to the representatives of the industrial workers, I should despair of finding one who could be expected to grasp the problems of University government or understand the terms in which they are discussed. The 'bankers, manufacturers, commercial magnates, lawyers, physicians, and clergymen' who make up the usual Board I have found moderately well-informed, intelligent, unbiased, and in general as well suited to the rôle prescribed for them in the report as any men we are likely to select. That they should not be wholly self-perpetuating, not usually chosen for life, in part representative of the alumni, and aided in their functions by conference with faculty committees, most Trustees and President would now readily grant.

"I am also in agreement with most of the recommendations as to the function and powers of the President, but I am struck by the extreme simplification of his duties implied in the report. The committee seem to regard these in terms of the formulation and initiation of educational policies on the one hand and administration on the other. Perhaps that is as it should be; it is not as it is. No mention occurs in the report, so far as I have observed, of the relation of the President to the alumni, to parents, to the general public. . .

"Now it is arguable that all these more extraneous activities are no proper part of the work of an academic executive. But under present conditions they are inescapable, and the ignoring of them indicates of how many elements in the problem of University government an association in which administrators are not represented may be unconscious. . .

"But it is in the powers of the Faculty that the Committee is chiefly interested, and especially in the matters of budget, appointment, promotion and dismissal. The majority of the committee hold that it would be well that in all cases the Faculty should have a recognized voice in the preparation of the annual budget—in large colleges and universities, through a budget committee elected by the Faculty. This they believe would tend to allay the discontent which



so frequently arises from inequities in the distribution of the salary budget.

"I am not sure that this is a correct statement of what would result. There is a good chance that the resentment against supposed inequities would be transferred from the president and trustees to the committee of colleagues, with dubious advantage to the peace of the academic commonwealth. It would tend to deprive the president of one of his most useful functions—that of serving as a sort of lightning rod for discontent, or better, perhaps, a scapegoat. I cannot help feeling that it is putting a severe strain on faculty society to subject it to the temptation of personal and social influence in the allotting of the salary fund.

"But the making of the budget is much more than the distribution of the salary fund. It involves decisions as to the division of income between instruction and physical equipment, and a faculty committee, to have sound judgment on such matters, would need to be informed on a large number of matters quite alien to their professional interests. All this means time and energy.

"This consideration leads me to a more general criticism of the tendency to increase faculty control. The granting to the teaching staff of even consultative powers on the large variety of administrative matters that has been claimed as coming within the sphere of their rights would mean a most serious invasion of the time now at their disposal for study. My own experience leads me to believe that there is at present in our colleges and still more in our universities much more discontent over the demands made on the time of a professor by administrative offices and committees than there is over the autocracy of the president or the trustees. What most scholarly teachers want is more time to attend to their business of learning and teaching." I have been arguing for part of their attention for the consideration of general educational aims and methods, and I should grudge to see it spent on work that can be attended to by hired men like the president or volunteers like the trustees. My objection to the wholesale enlargement of faculty control is not at all due to a jealousy of the presidential prerogative. I think most presidents would welcome the sharing of their power and authority if this meant giving them a little leisure for meditation and prayer. But it is no lightening of the load if one has not only to inform one's self, but also to convey that information to dozens of men on committees and then weigh the result on their deliberations. The question, in sum, seems



to me not so much one of democracy versus autocracy, as of the division of labor and the avoidance of waste.

"One set of questions, however, stands somewhat apart and ought not without examination to be included among those I have been discussing, *viz.*, those affecting appointment, promotion, and dismissal. With regard to the appointing of new teachers there is general agreement that as a rule these ought to be selected in consultation with the departments concerned, but that the final responsibility for recommendation to the Trustees ought to rest with the President. The matter of promotion is much more difficult. To leave it entirely to colleagues is to introduce into the life of the academic community the disturbing element already alluded to in connection with salaries. Moreover, every year between June and September scores of men receive calls which have to be met if men are to be retained, and to deprive the president of power to promote would mean the loss of many a good man. Consultation with colleagues when possible is, of course, wise and usual, but here also I believe the president must carry the final responsibility and bear the inevitable resentment.

"There is less eagerness to share the burden of dismissals, and I bear a grudge against the Association of University Professors because they have done so little to help in the solution of the question of the disposal of incompetent teachers. Yet everyone knows that the level of accomplishment of our institutions is kept down more by the number of misfits than by any other one cause, with the possible exception of the scarcity of good teachers. The report goes as far as to propose that even teachers on a definite term of appointment should have the right to full investigation by the judicial committee of the faculty of the grounds alleged for a proposed failure to reappoint. This means a judicial trial of every one year instructor—an incredible waste of time to guard a non-existent right, it seems to me. The short term appointment is essentially a trial contract, and either party is at liberty to decline to renew it for his own reasons. It would be intolerable if one could not make an appointment for one or two years without conferring the right to permanence unless a case were made out against the appointee.

"The indefinite appointment raises a more difficult question. Many a promising teacher is given a permanent appointment on what seem adequate grounds of promise and yet ceases by the time he reaches middle life to row his weight in the boat. Is the institution

to waste its funds and are the students to be defrauded of their due for twenty years to ensure a livelihood to a man or woman who has proven incompetent or become intellectually stagnant? I realize the force of the plea that a board of trustees should pay for their own mistakes, but is it they who pay? I realize that security of tenure is regarded as one of the compensations for the low rate of salaries in our profession, but does this justify us in dismissing the problem when the condition is so disastrous? I do not know the answer. Perhaps life appointments for both professors and executives are a mistake. In any case, the question is one with which professors as well as executives should concern themselves. I am inclined to think that early retirement on a pension would in many cases be a better economy than to continue to pay full salaries to men who kill the interest of students and discredit their subjects. But this is a rare practice and needs nerve on the part of an administrator unless the teaching part of the profession should support it as a policy. But a careful discussion of the problem by the American Association of University Professors would do much to convince the public that they were concerned for the welfare of their students and the efficiency of their institutions as well as for justice and freedom for themselves."

---

The partial misunderstanding by the speaker of the policy and methods of the Association of which he is an honorary member seemed to call for some correction and the attached comments from the chairman of Committee T have therefore been prepared for the *Bulletin*:

I make the following comments on President Neilson's discussion of the report of Committee T, "Place and Function of Faculties in University Government."

(1) The report makes no unfavorable reflection, either directly or by implication upon the good qualities of trustees in general.

(2) The report does not attempt to define by limitation all the responsibilities and opportunities of the presidential office. The title of Section II of the report is "The President and the Faculty." Obviously, the report is concerned only with those functions of the president which arise from his official and constitutional relations to faculty and trustees. The committee did not consider it to be a part of its duty, in outlining principles of faculty participation in university government, to deliver a homily to presidents on all the things that they ought to do and on all the things they ought to leave undone.

(3) The majority of the committee held that the faculty should have a recognized voice in the preparation of the annual budget. One who reads Section IV carefully will see that the committee did not commit itself categorically as to how this might best be done. As a matter of fact I am not acquainted with any important institution in which it is not done to some degree in some way. I do not see how those of senior rank in faculties can escape the danger of subjection "to the temptation of personal and social influence in the allotting of the salary fund." I do not see how presidents can very well escape hearing the opinions of members of their faculties on one another.

(4) I agree heartily with President Neilson's remarks on the danger, to learning and teaching, of over-much direct participation by professors in university administration. I agree with him that there should be as much division of labor as possible. But I fail to see that the acceptance of the principles of faculty participation in the report of Committee T necessarily implies the increase of administrative duties and committee services on the part of the members of the faculties. Whatever be the constitutional allotments of prerogatives among faculties, presidents and trustees, departmental affairs have to be administered directly by teachers, and committees must ponder and report upon matters of educational policy.

(5) President Neilson says, in discussing the question of dismissal of incompetent teachers, "The report goes as far as to propose that even teachers on a definite term of appointment should have the right to full investigation by the judicial committee of the faculty of the grounds alleged for a proposed failure to reappoint. This means a judicial trial of every one year instructor." The report neither says nor implies this. What the report does say is "In the event of the proposed dismissal of a member of the instructing staff, on indefinite tenure of appointment, *or before the expiration of a definite term of appointment*, the member in question should have the right to full investigation by the judicial committee of the grounds alleged for the proposed action." This means that a professor on permanent appointment should not be dismissed, and that a person on a limited term appointment should not be dismissed *before the end of his term*, without investigation and report by a faculty committee, *if the person in question so desires*.<sup>1</sup> This is all that the report implies. It assumes that a person appointed for a definite term and not reappointed has no case at all.

<sup>1</sup> Italics mine.

My acquaintance with the work of the Association of University Professors since its beginning does not lead me to agree with President Neilson's charge that they have done little to help in the solution of the question of the disposal of incompetent teachers. I know of a number of cases in which the committee on academic tenure has refused to take up complaints of dismissed teachers. I am sure that there have been many similar cases that I have not heard of. It must be admitted that some professors, like some other folk, are given to evading unpleasant responsibilities and like to throw the burden of dismissal on someone else's shoulders—usually the president's. But I think it is only fair to the American Association of University Professors to say that, in general, its officers and members have a high sense of responsibility and recognize that every right has a correlative obligation.

J. A. LEIGHTON, *Chairman, Committee T, 1917-1924.*

MAINTAINING STANDARDS WITHOUT EXCESSIVE STANDARDIZATION.—  
“Looking back now, one can see the remarkable advances made, the great increase in application of science in medical education, and the elevation of the general level of intelligence required to complete the work basic to the practice of medicine. But at the same time there was too early crystallization. Information was coming in at too rapid a rate to be digested and absorbed. The medical curriculum, although practically confined within the limits of four years, took on in a number of schools a fifth or interne year. The absorption of practically all the time of the student in set tasks was most unsatisfactory. The medical student upon graduation was gorged with the stuffing he had received but was not ready for the actual practice of medicine. At the same time medical faculties found themselves teaching to meet the requirements of state board examinations. They found it necessary to keep up a certain number of schedule hours in subjects that no longer needed emphasis in the undergraduate medical work because of the legal requirements. The Frankenstein of medical standards built with so much enthusiasm and devotion to ideals began to destroy individual initiative and to stand in the road of progress, bringing stasis in a stream in which ever more rapid motion was necessary. With the accession of new and necessary subjects, the rigorous demands of so-called specialties for representation and a part in the curriculum, there was combined the universal desire on the part of those already occupying the time of the student

not to let go. Subjects once introduced, although perhaps of decreasing importance, still had their adherents. The tenacity of the teacher in hanging on to all that he can get of the student's time is one of his most laudable but troublesome traits. The dead hand of the past maintains a strangle hold on the curriculum. What has been must always be until in the usual faculty wrestling match the new wins a foothold. To some a certain number of years of Latin seemed absolutely vital in the early training of a man to practice medicine. Some still seemed to think that a prescription had to be written in poor Latin in order to have a therapeutic effect. To others French or German seemed absolutely requisite. There was a general agreement that physics, chemistry and some form of biology were required in order that a student could enter intelligently upon his work upon physiology, pathology, bacteriology, etc. One could readily figure out that ten years would be required after high-school graduation to cover reasonably well all the subjects earnestly defended by various enthusiasts.

"In putting through the plans for these subjects the standard has taken the form of hours and units and residence over a certain period. The actual knowledge of the student was not necessarily the test. The quality of the instruction in these subjects differed widely all over the country, but the units required had the same numerical value. The handling of the pre-medical requirements as well as those of the medical school became one largely of figures. Addition of numbers with proper titles and to obtain proper totals became the object of deans everywhere. That this method had its ridiculous side was evidenced when the osteopathic and other similar schools were found capable of multiplying and adding faster before legislative committees in presenting curricula of their schools than could the so-called regular schools. Standards had resulted in a situation where quantitative measures became predominant. The cubists in medical training began to find a ready opening for short cuts and to insist that theirs was the real art and that fundamental training in anatomy, etc., belonged to the past. . .

"In college curricula, in university departments, in most courses of study leading to degrees, we find the same forces at work as have been noted in medicine. In some institutions the M.A. and even the Ph.D. degrees are attained by docile students or others made docile by sad experience taking the various set hurdles placed regularly for them by an over-conscientious and devoted faculty. Cer-



tainly at least for the Ph.D. degree standards should be so elastic as to permit this one degree to stand for original work and individual achievement without too much attention to units, courses and other evidences of the meshwork apparently needed to give stability to the ordinary reinforced concrete of our academic structure. . .

"Broadly speaking, we have made one very definite step forward and that is that we have a better type of brains available for instruction in our universities and particularly in our professional schools. The very elevation of standards, the setting of a definite goal, the longer period of time required in preparation and performance have brought about enough elimination of persons to be advantageous. One of the weaknesses of all teaching is to teach down to the type of brain available in the class. Certainly in the professional fields in America today well-trained minds can come in contact with good ones, thus opening the way towards more and more quality in the process. This very fact permits us to meet the teaching problem in a more intelligent way. We know that the good mind needs plenty of exercise and works best when taught with effort rather than when flaccid with indifference or self-confidence. . .

"Since, if we are to maintain standards without overstandardization, we must enhance the quality of the work, magnify the initiative of the teacher and enlarge the capacity of choice by the student, we must at the same time have some solid form of examination of a character to test the ability of a student to carry on in the work which he has begun, rather than a mere memory test. It is inevitable that such examinations should be insofar as possible of a practical character and that they must be prepared by those who are at the top, the greatest experts, those who view their particular fields from the standpoint of fundamental principles, rather than of the class so prone to make out examination papers who seek for exact information in the more minute fields of knowledge. The full advantage can only come if the teaching profession of the country agree to do less work for their students. . .

"There is a time element involved in all education. While knowledge of a subject can be tested to a considerable degree by proper examinations and while such a test is distinctly more just than the mere adding up of credentials, still proper preparation for research, for teaching, for life outside of the university walls or for a profession demands time for study and for the building of advanced work upon elementary work. We can still maintain our system of time require-



ments and our units of machinery at the registrar's office and our standards if we can devise methods of teaching and methods of testing based upon quality rather than quantity. . .

"In concluding may I suggest the following procedures as worthy of some thought:

- (1) Reduce rigid requirements radically.
- (2) By careful studies by experts outline central core of essential parts of required subjects.
- (3) Insist that every college student shall take at least one subject where he can obtain facts first hand.
- (4) Hold the student to solid achievement in tasks once undertaken.
- (5) Increase the number of set papers required of students to stimulate individual work.
- (6) Provide a marking system which will serve as a basis of self-valuation to the student.
- (7) Make calendar consumption secondary to actual achievement.
- (8) For admission to the university there should be required:
  - (a) A record of scholastic achievement;
  - (b) The passing on an intelligence test appropriate for a student who has covered the high-school period.
  - (c) A record of the personal qualities of the student, physical, mental and if possible moral. Some form of character test is particularly required.
- (9) Provide a comprehensive examination at the end of the sophomore year along the lines of the college entrance board examinations, covering any four subjects, in order to test the student's capacity to go beyond elementary college work. This will provide for the gradual unfolding of the American university beginning with the junior year and for the development of the necessary junior colleges, and will also serve as a standardizing device in the acceptance of transfer students and of students whose courses have been irregular.
- (10) The standard for the degree of doctor of philosophy should be so changed that the recipient of that degree should be freed from the necessity of taking set courses of any kind during the latter part of his work. It should be a degree conferred upon one who has done original research. Standardization of this degree so that its recipient reads certain languages and has covered certain minors and majors is a mistake. The departments recommending candidates for this degree should take full responsibility for them
- (11) Degrees in engineering, medicine and law, once granted by a

reputable university, should serve as a basis for admission to practice before the public in the domain in which the university has given certification. Those who wish to practice these professions and who are not graduates of recognized universities should be required to take examinations under the auspices of the state universities. The setting up of examining boards, while advantageous in many ways, has reached a point where it handicaps the development of the professions more than it helps. Either the boards must change their type of examinations, making them of a practical character, or some other device must be found to free the universities and their professional schools from the narrowing influences of rigid legal standards in the field of education."

R. L. WILBUR

Association of American Universities, October, 1924.

HOW TO MAINTAIN STANDARDS WITHOUT EXCESSIVE STANDARDIZATION.—"The graduate school in becoming so largely a continuation school for college graduates has become also what might well be called a university. Excluding the subjects which we stigmatize as purely professional, it tends to present a well-rounded program of studies whereby any student who is sufficiently mature really to want to study and has had an elementary education which has made him able to read intelligently and know what he is about, may acquire either a well-rounded education or advance to specialization and research. I do not think that this fact has been sufficiently remarked, although we must have seen it repeatedly in operation. Forced to frame a program of studies adequate to the preparation of students who are admitted to the graduate school in terms of what they are admitted from, we have tended more and more to create an institution which is strikingly comparable with the continental universities of Europe. I am aware that this rarely appears so on paper, for the printed regulations to which we have grown accustomed make it appear that the graduate school succeeds the college in subject-matter as much as it does in time. But I am also aware that practice confirms the observation. We are all familiar with the student who, after graduation from college comes to the graduate school to study, let us say philosophy in earnest. He knows little or nothing of its history. He has never mastered logic. He has a poor equipment in language, history and science. He is admitted because he has an acceptable bachelor's degree. What will happen to him may be left as problematical as it appears on his admission. But there is no doubt at all

as to what may happen to him. He has entered into an opportunity where all his deficiencies may be made good and where he will find friends to help him make them good. If he doesn't run foul of the requirements for a degree, he can have the intellectual time of his life. That is what a university would offer him and that is what admission to the graduate school does offer him. The only thing he has to fear is the stupidity of deans, other administrative officers and those who curse his inadequate preparation. Viewed in the light of its program of studies, or shall I rather say *the* program of studies which is made available by admission to the graduate school, that school has tended to become not a graduate school at all, but a genuine university. That fact, I have come to believe, is the cause of all our major difficulties and particularly of the difficulties which I have taken the title of this paper to suggest. We are attempting to do one thing by our standardizing and standards, while we are also doing something else to which these attempts are so often irrelevant or we are trying to accommodate to a given situation standards, which are conceived in terms of a situation which is quite different.

"Having standardized admissions in terms of what the students are admitted from, we have tended to conform the standards of instruction accordingly, subjecting the students to regulated supervision, assigning them tasks and passing or failing them according as they do well or ill in the work assigned. All this coddles immaturity. . .

"There is probably no other university system in the world so paternalistic as ours and no other with less reason for being so. The reasons given in favor of it are, to my mind, reasons why it should not exist. We are told that we are under an obligation to educate the student. The obligation of a university toward its students is, however, not to educate them but to force intellectual independence upon them. We are told that we must prepare students for our degrees. A university, however, does not prepare students for degrees. It gives them rather the opportunity to do something which may be worthy of a degree. Complaints of the low intellectual tone of our graduate schools, of the crudity of our doctors of philosophy and of the meagerness of our scholarship generally are all exaggerated. Yet in these respects we find comparisons odious. I am confident that we should have a different finding, if somewhere in the course of their education we forced students to be free. To be dogmatic in the graduate school, there should be no approval of courses of study, no committees in charge of students' work, no teaching which

implies grades and credits, no examinations on courses elected, and in general no holding of the student's hands. He should be left free to do what he likes and take the consequences. And what a happy relief that would be for us! Under such an arrangement the plea that we had no leisure for research would be a confession of incompetence.

"If the graduate school has become a university, and if we desire, as I think we should in a society like ours, to develop and perfect it in that direction, then I find it difficult to justify its present requirements for admission. They appear to be justified for two reasons, first because they exclude the uneducated and secondly because they protect our degrees. I am not convinced that they do either. I am not convinced that they give us the best student body we might have or the student body we ought to have. I suppress, however, the evidence, preferring to approach directly the subject to which criticism might lead painfully. If we expect to undertake and cultivate the university conception in the interest of maintaining high standards of instruction, degrees and research, it is not with college graduates but with the idea of a university that we should begin, not with the traditional idea, however, but with an idea agreeable to the society in which the university is to exist. We are all, I think, quite sensible that a beginning like this is highly desirable in our American society. We need universities better adapted to the character of our civilization. Moreover, and this is a subject to which I promised to refer again, the outstanding problems of research are the offspring not of what is done in colleges, but of what is done in society, industry and arts. They are problems conceived by the farsighted and mature. They are maintained by working at them rather than by preparing others to work at them. It is a little disingenuous to suppose that they will thrive best in a school made up of college graduates. They will, however, thrive in a university so conceived that a genuine opportunity is provided for them through connections with the sources from which they spring."

F. J. E. WOODBRIDGE

Association of American Universities, October, 1924.

#### THE PLACE OF RELIGION IN HIGHER EDUCATION IN AMERICA.—

"We have been forward in teaching sciences but we have been very derelict in getting to our students any adequate comprehension of just the relationship of the whole scientific field to some of the deep issues of life. During these years we have been saying that the issue

between science and religion was settled fifty years ago, and now we awake to discover that the rank and file of the American people have no real comprehension of what science is, or what science is teaching. Now indeed it is a curious situation in which we find ourselves. You and I have lived through a marvelous transition in thought, and I sometimes wonder that we have done as well as we have, when I think of what you and I, for example, were taught along religious lines, and what we believe now; for God no longer stays aloft, unmoved by the woes and passions of men, but 'In Him we live and move and have our being.' Christ is no longer the center of metaphysical discussion about His person, but all of our thought, political, commercial and economic, is increasingly Christlike. Man is no longer the wreck and ruin of a once perfect harmony, but he is a chaos, not yet reduced to order. Sin is not merely a taint of the past, but selfishness, pure and simple. Salvation is not saving the sinful soul from the fires of Hell, but the making of all men into good ones here and now. All things are not true, because they are in the Bible, but they are in the Bible because they are true. Now these represent tremendous shiftings; they do not represent any loss of religious conviction; but how much have you and I done to see to it that college men and women know even this much; moreover, I ask you this serious question, 'Have you ever encountered such deep, abysmal, unfathomable darkness about religion as you have on college campuses, in university clubs, and other places?' Many people today, modern in their point of view in most respects imagine that life is what Thomas Aquinas made it, and they do not know that modern religious thought has changed as much during the last quarter century as any scientific discipline. There is our difficulty. So when I talk of the relation of knowledge to virtue, or if you please, character and religion, and all the rest, I believe that our most dismal failure in the last two decades in American higher education has been our failure to recognize that there is power in ideas, in the building of character, and to see to it that character was grounded upon a clear understanding and comprehension of the relationships of some of the disciplines which we have been teaching to the undergraduates. . .

"In England, in one respect, socially, the student is a boy. What do you suppose our boys would say if we told them they had to sleep in the same bed every night, had to be in at certain hours? These Oxford boys are boys. The college is responsible for them. But



when it comes to things intellectual—they are men. The term time is a period for the widening of the horizon; and vacation is a time for hard study, and they have gained intellectual interests and mental stamina. Now, look at the American boy—just the opposite. Socially, he is a man, whether he lives in a dormitory or a fraternity house—he does as he pleases—but intellectually he is a boy. We tell him what he has got to do, and he does it, and mark you, some students know this, but they are not saying much about it, because it is not 'good form'; but there is the appearance of a dawn in many institutions. The day is coming when class work will be abolished, and we will say to men with minds, 'You are free to develop that which is fine and good and beautiful and true'; and the base man will not be admitted or welcomed; and the men with intellectual virility will gather, and they will gradually leaven the lump; and the day will come when there will troop back to American campuses those arts and goddesses that we love; for, I am convinced, that in the heart of American youth is the desire for actual intellectual freedom, and we do not give it to them.

"All American life has been objectified. The thing that America needs more than anything else from American colleges and universities is the type of leader who understands that the first requisite of a public servant is not the desire to know what the people want, but the purpose to help the people want what they ought to have; and we will only produce that kind of a leader when we get the inner reality for which I have been pleading, and send out a generation of students who understand religion in its largest terms, and know that we can only build a life with an inner reality which matches the stern ineradicable order of truth that life gives us—this I conceive to be 'The Place of Religion in Higher Education in America.' "

C. A. RICHMOND, *Bulletin Association of American Colleges*.

THE UNIVERSITY'S INTELLECTUAL RESPONSIBILITY.<sup>1</sup>—"There are two theories about what education ought to do to the human mind. The first of these theories holds that education means subduing the mind, bringing it into obedience to authority, making it docile rather than independent. Such a theory restricts the activity of the mind to the boundaries of such territories as its advocates consider safe and sane, and marks with 'no thoroughfare' signs the entrance to all others. . .

<sup>1</sup> Address delivered at the opening exercise of the University of North Carolina.

"The second theory is precisely the opposite. It holds that the business of education with men's minds is not to subjugate them, but to set them free; that the essential condition of intellectual growth is the maintenance of an atmosphere of freedom of thought and of discussion; that if men are to be educated men they must learn to respect facts, to weigh evidence, to reach conclusions based on facts and evidence, not on prejudice or preference; that they must follow truth wherever it leads; that in a conflict between authority and truth the higher allegiance is always to truth. It holds to that great utterance of Thomas Jefferson, 'I have sworn upon the altar of God eternal hostility to every form of tyranny over the human mind.' Such a theory of education the university holds.

"Toward all such attempts the responsibility of an educational institution is clear. It matters not whether they are directed, as once they were, against the physicist and the astronomer, or against the biologist or the economist. They are all equally fatal to the very conditions which make possible intellectual growth. They all lead inevitably in the direction of a civilization that is characterized by intellectual sterility. It is impossible to restrict the freedom of intellectual inquiry and teaching in any direction without damage to the whole intellectual structure; without creating an atmosphere of evasiveness and compromise and even downright mental dishonesty that students carry with them all the balance of their lives. It is impossible to fit men to participate effectively in a twentieth-century civilization on the basis of a medieval theory of education.

"A critic, nationally known for his caustic tongue, recently said about the south that 'it is almost as sterile artistically, intellectually, culturally, as the Sahara Desert.' That isn't true, but if the south wants it to be true, there is one formula that will lead infallibly to that result: Let the south give way to activities now going on within its borders that are aimed against the freedom of its educational institutions, and the deed is done. The lesson of history is plain for any man to read; great civilizations are built only by free minds. There is a slavery of the mind, as of the body; there is a tyranny over the intellect that is as much opposed to the spirit of American institutions and as fatal to their maintenance as is political tyranny. Against such tyranny it is the duty of an institution that is growing free men uncompromisingly to set its face."

H. W. CHASE.

A DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION.—(Extracts from a discussion of the Brown plan of reorganizing federal departments in relation to the proposed Department of Education, by President J. H. MacCracken): "It is a tremendous step forward to have won recognition in the platform of the victorious party for a department of education of any kind and the endorsement of a President so overwhelmingly trusted by the nation. You will recall the progress made since I spoke to you on this subject five years ago. First there was to be a department of welfare, then a department of welfare and education was conceded, later this became education and welfare, then education and relief, and before we meet again it may undergo one more transformation and emerge into the light of day as education and health. Health, I think, is more akin to education than relief. Both have to do with the future, both are children of hope and progress, both kindle the imagination with the untold possibilities of the new day. I do not propose to take your time this morning to discuss details of a department of education. The committees on education of both the House and the Senate held a hearing last winter and some fifteen hundred pages of fine type have been printed in the record. Those of you who are interested will find there the subject discussed pro and con from every angle. To my mind this is not a question of details any more than the League of Nations is a question of details. It is a question of vision—of your dream of the perfect state, of your inherent desire as teachers to live and to create. One could not talk with the late President Harding about a department of education without feeling that to his mind a teacher was a sort of superior domestic servant worthy of the same recognition as a prosperous farmer accords to the teacher of the country school who boards around from family to family. One could not hear the senator from Utah in the last Congress describe nefarious professors of chemistry who import duty-free test tubes at two cents and sell them at ten cents and use the difference for their own purposes without realizing that the noble senator regarded university professors as a sort of five and ten cent variety of crooks—too weak to be feared, too mean to be trusted. One can not see the Bureau of Education ignored in matters of Federal Education as in the recent Immigration Bill, which gave not to the Federal Commissioner of Education but to the Secretary of Labor the right to decide whether this or that college or university is a suitable institution for an alien to attend, and placed even fair Harvard and proud

California in the position before the nations of the world of having first to seek the stamp of approval of the representative of the labor unions before even the haughty department of state charged with the administration of international relations dare authorize its consuls to stamp the passport of a prospective student in Jerusalem or Allahabad bound for Cambridge or for Berkeley without feeling that the million teachers in this country will be unworthy their free citizenship in a free land, if they do not demand a voice in the councils of the nation commensurate with the sacredness and dignity of their calling. The lions in the path—the fear of federal tyranny, the dread of introducing politics into the schools, are chained lions—they would be dangerous if there was nothing to hold them, or if the chains of unwritten law and human nature were to break, but they will not break, at least not without a revolution.”

*School and Society*, February 7, 1925.

BRIEF NOTES.—*School and Society* for January 17th contains an article by E. E. Lindsay on “Scheduling Practices in State Universities and Colleges.” A statistical analysis is made of practices in state universities and colleges in 42 states. Topics dealt with include: schedules, convocations, registration, use of rooms, length of laboratory periods, the scholastic day and week, and faculty teaching loads.

The *Journal of Education* for November 6 contains an article on a Responsible College Presidency, by Dr. J. E. Kirkpatrick, recently at the University of Michigan, now at Olivet College.

*School and Society* for February 7th contains Dean Walter’s annual statistics of registration in American universities and colleges for 1924.

The *Harvard Alumni Bulletin* for February contains an interesting article by President Lowell on the Government of Harvard College, based on an address delivered by him at the annual dinner of the Harvard Club of New York, January 23rd.

*School Review* for December, 1924, contains an article by Ernest H. Wilkins, Chairman of Committee G, on Freshman Week at the University of Chicago.

## PRESIDENTIAL ADDRESSES AND REPORTS

AMHERST, INAUGURAL ADDRESS.—“The college trustees—I refer now to the class throughout our whole land—form the most powerful, the most responsible, the most abused, of all who are connected with our institutions of higher learning; and they have not the consolation of distinction or the makeweight of glory. I do not recall a single tablet with the inscription, ‘Trustees of Blank College.’ Their contribution to college administration is unrewarded as it is fundamental. It would be interesting by the way, to have the boards of trustees of our colleges and the members of the Association of University Professors exchange functions for a year. But while the duties of the trustees are unrewarded, as I have said, they are fundamental; and it is worth while to consider what might well be the constitution of such a board.

“To review briefly the history of the business administration of colleges. In medieval times, this administration was in the hands of students and teachers. In some cases, later, the state assumed control; in others, as at Oxford and Cambridge, increasing funds and private benefactions involved the choice of trustees. Holding the purse strings these men soon began to appoint officers and to determine policy. It was not long before it was inevitable that there should be a liberal delegation of power to a faculty. This, of course, has been true at Amherst. Our curriculum and discipline have been and are in the hands of the teachers. As to discipline, this control is practically absolute; and, as to the course of study, the same has been true, except where there has been a fundamental change of policy. Moreover, if there is anything that has been peculiarly characteristic of the Anglo-Saxon race, it is its unwillingness to be clothed in the strait-jacket of pure legality. England has no written constitution. Her highest controlling law is largely an atmosphere and an environment, the sum total of her custom at any one time or any one period. So, side by side with the static document that embodied our own fundamental law, there has grown up since its adoption a customary law which interprets and supplements. Now and then crystallized public opinion is shown by changes in this great law. Usage makes itself felt; and the constitution, rigid as it may seem, must bend to meet the demands of time.

“So fundamental law which is prescribed by the charter of a college



—if it is to have vitality, it must bend, be plastic, adapt itself to changing conditions in the refining experience of college practice. This has been the rule at all our institutions. It has certainly been so at Amherst. Aside from the inevitable limitations imposed by the making of a budget, a necessary balancing of income and expenditure, the Amherst president and the Amherst faculty have had practically all the freedom they cared to exercise, all the responsibility they were willing to assume. While my experience as actual president is, of course, limited, it has been my privilege to serve three times as acting executive. In this position I have had the opportunity to come into intimate contact with the Board of Trustees, and I have always felt the urge toward freedom rather than the gall of restriction, the spur rather than the curb. . .

“As long as trustees and teachers are sympathetic, unselfish in thinking rather of the best interests of the college than of the joy of dominion or personal victory, so long as they are hospitable toward one another’s opinions, the best type of cooperation will always be possible. Assuming the present system to go on as it is likely to do for at least some years to come, one may ask what should be the qualifications of a Board of Trustees. As to size, it should be large enough to be representative, small enough to be intimate. It has to administer the material things of college life, so that it must contain a goodly proportion of experienced men of affairs. It must ever be in touch with the primary intellectual and spiritual aims of the institution; and it should, therefore, contain some men especially engaged in the promotion of these great aims, men whose professions are teaching or the ministry. It must draw its nourishment—I mean not alone its sinews of war, but its inspiration and enthusiasm to achieve the highest of which it is capable—from its graduates; so that the great body of its alumni should always have representation in its personnel. There should be some lawyers, not narrow legalists, but broad-minded men who know that there has been a past, are fairly sure that there is to be a future, and are on fire with the thought that there is a present—men whose careers and thoughts fit into the heritage of the glorious common law which was our birthright as a nation. As to years, it should contain men who have lived, with youth and its reservoir of experience behind them, who have garnered wisdom because they have known the world; men who can bear witness to triumphs and defeats, who have seen theories tried out by practice, whose philosophy is inevitably pragmatic, ‘Will it work?’

There must be young men, those to whom adventure is like oxygen; men born to initiate, glowing with enthusiasm, men who by their close contact with the youth of today shall make sure that due heed be given to the dreams and aspirations of those upon whom the future must be built. It is too often overlooked that these characteristics do not entirely cease to exist at fifty. It is only a question of emphasis. There is no question that the ship must be steered as well as propelled; and if the task of navigating it is to be shared, the older man must be at the helm and the younger in the engine room.

"Such a Board of Trustees will be tolerant, will realize that times change and we change with them, that theories of education pass and new ones take their places, not because the old ones were not efficient in their day, but because new conditions of thought and life need new remedies. . .

"So much for the make-up, so much for the attitude of the ideal board; and now for the faculty—for the teachers. It is this body that, in the last analysis, holds the weal or woe of the college within its hands. Trustees may hold the purse strings, alumni may furnish the enthusiasm, but it is the body of teachers who are fundamentally responsible for the creation and carrying on of educational policy. . .

"So, while the teacher must inhale freedom and exhale freedom while he must be conscious that he is leading his pupil in the world of glorious adventure; yet he must never fail to remind him that there are moorings and buoys, and that by these he must steer his course.

"This leads to another characteristic that belongs to the ideal teacher. He must be in the world, yet not of it. The school years, as the etymology of the word 'school' suggests, are a time of leisure, of apartness. Before the dust of the world comes to blind the eyes, before its noise and confusion deafen, before the pleadings of self-interest prejudice, the student is brought into contact with great principles of action, great ideals which lead him out of selfishness into the pure light of the world as it ought to be. The greatest teachers of mankind have drawn apart for a time before beginning their ministry for self-study and meditation. Mohammed did this; Jesus did it; every one of us must do it if he is to brush the cobwebs from his brain and see truth eye to eye. He cannot, however, forget or allow his pupils to forget that there is a very real world to which he and they must return, to which they must bring their principles and theories for testing, for which all before has been only a prepara-

tion. In ancient Greece there was the discipline of the Academia, of the fascinating and stimulating wandering in Athenian groves; but all around was an Athens that must be made great, an Athens that must be defended, an Athens that placed demands upon citizenship which could not be ignored. Socrates and Plato and Aristotle were training men, possible statesmen. The teacher, then, must have vision; but he must not be a visionary. He may live in beautiful groves apart 'from the madding crowd's ignoble strife'; but, if he is wise, he will see that many vistas are cut through which he may look into the world, a world that is longing for guidance, demanding leadership, a world whose progress rests upon honest thinking. He must realize that it is immoral not to think straight; that intellectual dishonesty is a poison; that wrong concepts are the malignant germs which bring on great world fevers.

"The prime function of a university is to investigate, to enlarge the boundaries of known truth. The prime function of a college is to teach; but just as the urge, the inspiration to investigation comes often from the stimulus of teaching, so the teacher in the college cannot wisely forego research. This must be secondary, just as in the graduate school teaching must be secondary; but research is of profound importance in its contribution to the success of the teacher. To be in touch with new truth, to realize that he is a seer, even though a modest one, adds fire and enthusiasm to the teacher as he engages in his class room work. Research is an atmosphere, a bracing air which puts red blood into the mind. The effect upon the pupil is immediate and profound. He instantly feels that he is in touch with a discoverer; he may even catch the contagion and discover himself.

"As to athletics, the present administration, representing I believe the prevailing opinion of the teaching body, most cordially believes in them. It has been said that the remedy for democracy is more democracy; so, in my opinion, the remedy for athletics is more athletics. Students are often accused of over-devotion to these outside activities; and the charge is no doubt true unless they are wisely regulated and checked, unless the proper balance is maintained between the curriculum and the extra-curricular activities. . .

"I have said that the remedy for athletics is more athletics. The ideal situation in any college would be where every student, not bodily handicapped, should in his leisure hours, play some game. It is for this reason that the trustees have been so liberal in their appropriations for our athletic plant. . .

"The fundamental aim of education is this search after truth, intellectual and spiritual truth. In its ideal perfection this means that its votary shall divest himself of all self-interest in contemplation of the fundamental truths of science, literature and history and life, that he shall strive to mirror truth as the unruffled surface of a mountain lake mirrors the sky, magnifying nothing, minifying nothing, distorting nothing. Seek truth and pursue her. She is an honorable maiden with a dowry, the value of which man may not measure, but she is discreet withal. She will have naught of mercenary suitors, but to him that woos her for herself, she unlocks her treasure store of intellectual and spiritual wisdom, the priceless gift of an all-wise God."

GEORGE D. OLDS in *School and Society*, February 17.

UNIVERSITY OF BUFFALO.—The annual report of the Chancellor reports the adoption of a uniform set of by-laws applying to all divisions of the university and to the appointment of an extra secretary whose most important task is to be the continuous study of the educational operations of the university. Out of such study should come data to indicate how the several activities of the institution can be made more effective, and what economies in operation are possible. His office will thus become a central fact-finding agency for the university. The second duty of the executive secretary is to assist the Chancellor in the routine work of administration.

Attention is also called to the improvement of the official publications of the university. By action of the committee on General Administration, a single editor of this series has been appointed. He has already brought about a unity of form and style in the university documents which previously did not characterize them.

"*Honor Courses.* In my report for the year 1922-23 I recorded the action of the faculty in establishing the so-called honors courses and I described the simple regulations under which these courses would be operated. The College has now had one year of experience with this venture. As the Dean notes, eight students of superior scholarship were selected as honors students at the beginning of the year under review. They were relieved of all formal requirements, except the courses in psychology and philosophy prescribed for juniors and seniors. Each chose his field of specialization and then proceeded under the direction of the head of the department, to carry out a program of study in this special field and in related fields using

at will any facilities offered by the University through its regularly organized courses, its libraries and its laboratories. There were frequent extended individual conferences with the instructors guiding the work. The honors students as a group met with all their instructors for general discussion and conference once a week. Each student was expected to produce rather elaborate theses and reports. The final success of each was tested in an oral examination before the committee in charge of honors courses.

"The effect of the honors courses on the whole College community has been remarkable. Both the students and the instructors participating are unanimously of the opinion that never have they been partners in a teaching enterprise more vital or rewarding. For the students it has been at the same time an emancipation and a stimulus. None abused the privileges. All acquired a new orientation to the world of knowledge and a real motivation. The work which each one carried forward was highly individual. As far as possible it was determined by the student's tastes and talents. The only common test applied to it was whether it was genuinely creative.

"It will readily be seen that the direction of a group of students like this, even a small group, lays heavy obligations on the instructors. Members of the faculty who supervised the study of the honors students, therefore, accepted an additional burden. But all have felt that the results fully justified the effort. They have been dissatisfied only with the inevitable limitation of the time they could devote to the task.

"The influence of the honors courses on the students and instructors not actually involved in them is likewise noticeable. Doubts of the sacred sufficiency of conventional courses with their accompanying machinery of grades and hours and credits are everywhere manifest. It seems safe to assert that in this College a new conception of the real objectives of liberal education is emerging.

"Although the number affected by this experiment is still small, I have no hesitation in declaring that the University has undertaken nothing in any division more significant or more promising. Presently, however, we must find a different designation for the undertaking. These are not 'honors courses.' They are not courses at all. In fact, the best thing about them is their dissimilarity to courses as ordinarily organized and administered. The flexibility of the venture in its initial stages was part of the experiment. Now we are sure that in its very flexibility lies its greatest strength."



*Problems of the University.* "The University as a whole, and particularly the College of Arts and Sciences, needs a central personnel service. Such a service, under the direction of the Chancellor, would study both the individual students and the materials of instruction. It would record all important facts about each student. It would be charged with the administration of tests. It would be the directing agency for vocational and educational guidance.

"A no less important part of its function, however, would be the continuous study of the occupational fields into which students go and of the educational processes of the University. An effective personnel service of this order would progressively mold curricula into instruments of greater precision. It is peculiarly desirable in an institution like this where so many new projects are under way. The initial annual cost of such a service would be from ten to fifteen thousand dollars.

"At the earliest possible moment the University should be in a position to establish courses in engineering. Especially is there the greatest need and the most insistent demand for instruction in chemical engineering. The University has nearly all the physical equipment necessary for this work. It has been assured of the hearty cooperation of local industries. The amount of money required to make a modest beginning in the field of chemical engineering would be small. Out of it would inevitably grow a school of engineering with many departments. Probably the beginning should not be made until support for some of the following developments is in sight. But I have no hesitation in saying that the Niagara frontier needs a school of engineering more than it needs any other educational agency not yet established."

CHICAGO, THE PRESIDENT'S CONVOCATION STATEMENT.—"Perhaps the most important of all these committees is the one which is considering the distribution of students' time. Dante says that nearly all the troubles of the human race come from not knowing how to use time; it is certainly true that nearly all the troubles of the undergraduate body come from this cause. The first task of the Committee on the Distribution of Students' Time has been to ascertain the facts as to the ways in which students actually spend their time. This is being done by use of a very carefully prepared questionnaire which calls for a statement of the time spent by each student in a typical quarter on each of his courses; in other studies, in literary or

artistic interests; in non-athletic activities; in athletics; in other exercise; in class, fraternity, and club interests; in religious and social interests; in self-support; in transportation, etc. Some 2000 of these questionnaires have been returned, and the results are being tabulated as a basis for constructive study. . ."

*Military Training in the University.* 1. The Government, presumably and at least officially, representing the mind of the people, has decided on a policy of moderate preparedness. This policy is neither militaristic nor anti-militaristic, in the sense that it represents a determination not to go to war even for purely defensive purposes, but distinctly precautionary. Under it the country is hoping to avert war, but is prepared not to be taken wholly at a disadvantage if war should come. It also takes account of the necessity for a certain amount of police duty even in time of peace.

2. On the whole, there is much to be said for this attitude of the government. We do not want war; we hope, and will do all in our power, to avert it, even submitting to great loss if necessary, and using possible effort to settle differences domestic or international without resort to force; yet we cannot shut our eyes to the fact that we may sometime be forced to defend ourselves against aggression, and that it is necessary for that reason to have a few men who have knowledge enough of military affairs to be fairly quickly convertible into officers capable of training and leading others.

3. The government has appealed to the universities of the country and to the University of Chicago in particular, to cooperate with it in raising up a limited number of such men. This fact itself creates a strong presumption in favor of our complying with this request. Unless the policy of the government is clearly wrong, so that it is our duty to resist it, its request in accordance with the policy which has been officially and nationally adopted has a strong claim upon us.

4. If the University responds to this request, it has a right to demand that the work shall be (a) in all respects of high quality educationally, (b) conducted in the spirit and with the aims above stated—as a means of preventing rather than encouraging war.

5. Properly conducted, such work as the Military Department offers has real educational value, and is on that ground educationally defensible.

6. If the work is put on a sound educational basis, and conducted in the spirit above indicated, and if on this ground and those pre-

vously stated it is included in the plans of the University, it ought to have the unequivocal endorsement of the university and there should be such a declaration of the University's attitude as would leave the students in no doubt that if they choose this work they have the full approval of the University in doing so.

E. D. BURTON, *University Record*, April and July, 1924.

COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY, EXTRACTS FROM THE ANNUAL REPORTS. *President Butler*.—"Columbia University is its own most severe critic. It has resisted the vice, or the virtue of complacency and constantly examines and re-examines its own organization and activities with a view to their betterment. During the past year no part of the University has escaped this searching of the spirit. The Faculty of Columbia College has been studying how best to establish and introduce a course introductory to the study of the natural and experimental sciences to parallel the course introductory to the study of contemporary civilization established four years ago. The faculty of applied science has had under earnest consideration the question of the adequacy and wisdom of its present program of study and of the existing high standard required for admission to its rolls. The faculty of medicine has been strengthening both its laboratory and its clinical teaching, and, like the faculty of applied science, has under consideration the whole question of its program in order to determine how far the medical school program of today is satisfactory when measured by the demands of the practicing physician and surgeon. The faculty of law has carried to successful completion its plans for the organization of advanced instruction and research in the field of public and private laws, in connection with which the degree of doctor of law has been authorized. The non-professional graduate faculties of political science, philosophy and pure science have cooperated in the creation of a representative joint Committee on Graduate Instruction, which, under the chairmanship of the Dean, will deal with many matters which have heretofore absorbed the attention of those faculties as a whole, thereby releasing their members from direct participation in some of that necessary academic business which so often absorbs time and effort that might better be given to research and publication. The professional work in architecture, in business, and in journalism has not stood still, and the many-sided undertakings of the University Extension and the summer session have both widened and deepened. . .

"During the year there was brought to satisfactory conclusion the discussion of a matter of University policy which has, in one form or another, been under consideration for more than forty years. When the faculty of political science was established in 1880 Professor Burgess had in mind the development of research and the training of scholars and teachers in the field of private law as well as in that of public law, and he suggested that side by side with the degree of doctor of philosophy the degree of doctor of law should be instituted to regard the satisfactory performance of advanced students in that field. Objection was raised both by representatives of the faculty of law and by other university bodies and the suggestion remained unacted upon. Several times in the intervening years this proposal has been renewed in various forms, and once or twice has seemed on the point of adoption by the University Council and by the Trustees. Each time, however, fatal objection was encountered, and it was not until a year or two ago that the project secured sufficiently widespread support to make its acceptance likely. After the older and more familiar objections to instituting this degree had been cleared away, there remained one which had large influence both in the University Council and with the Trustees. It was urged that if the degree of doctor of law should not be instituted no logical objection could be interposed to the later establishment of the degree of doctor in architecture, in business, in education, in engineering, in journalism, or in any other field which the University might cultivate, and such extension and diversification of the degree of doctor were held to be objectional both in principle and in practical working. When the subject was considered from this point of view, a solution was found in the decision that, before the degree of doctor of law was established, it be determined and declared to be the definite policy of Columbia University to confine the degree of doctor, when given in course to reward the completion of advanced instruction and research, to the four traditional academic groups and the four historic university faculties of law, medicine, theology and philosophy. . .

"It was very strongly felt that no support should be given by Columbia University to the movement going on throughout the United States to multiply degrees, including advanced degrees of every sort and kind. For a generation past there has been a general breaking up in the field of higher education in the United States. New subjects of study are constantly introduced and their introduction is not infrequently accompanied by the suggestion that new

and specific academic degrees be instituted to accompany them. The result has been to create the impression that higher degrees were not of particular distinction, and that they might be obtained without any marked scholarly achievement by patience and the payment of a designated fee. Columbia University has now taken a definite position in reference to this tendency and has planted itself upon historic ground which cannot be successfully attacked. The four historic university groups or faculties are those of law, medicine, theology and philosophy. In the early history of universities the degree of doctor was conferred in each of these fields and in these alone. In the field of law, while the degree of doctor is widely given in Europe as a degree in course, both in Great Britain and in the United States it has long been used chiefly as an honorary distinction. In the field of medicine the degree of doctor has most unfortunately been assimilated to and confused with that of bachelor, and is everywhere in the United States given on the completion of an undergraduate professional course in medicine and surgery. In the field of theology the degree of doctor has become, except on the continent of Europe, almost exclusively an honorary degree, but as Columbia University maintains no faculty of theology that fact is for us a matter of indifference. In the field of philosophy, which represents the seven liberal arts as taught in the old universities, the degree of doctor of philosophy is maintained and grows stronger and of more consequence every year as the accepted designation of those who have successfully pursued advanced instruction and research in any part of this large and indefinite field. It is to be borne in mind that all the newer subjects of university study are in reality developments and subdivisions of the original seven liberal arts and, therefore, fall readily within the historic field of the faculty of philosophy. The degree of doctor of philosophy, therefore, is the appropriate degree for award to those who have qualified themselves for it by advanced work and research, either in the other group of philosophical subjects, such as philosophy, letters and science, or in the newer groups, such as engineering, education, journalism and business. . ."

*Dean Hawkes.* "One of the least satisfactory features of collegiate administration is the system of advisory relations between students and faculty. Wherever Deans are gathered together the adviser system is usually discussed with the concluding comment, provided



the whole truth is told, that the system does not mean as much as it should either for student or teacher.

"For the past ten or twelve years each student of Columbia College with the exception of those who are looking forward to the professional schools, has nominated a member of the teaching staff as his adviser. The pre-professional groups have been assigned to the assistants to the Dean as their advisers. No one feels that (except in the case of certain of these professional groups) the system has contributed all that it should to a wholesome and natural relation between students and teachers. During the present year the Committee on Instruction has made a study of conditions and has put into operation a modified plan that seems to promise good results.

"The function of the faculty adviser of a student is two-fold. In the first place he is supposed to be familiar with the requirements for the degree, and to see to it that the student plans his courses so that each of these requirements is satisfied at the proper time. As a matter of fact this supposition is rarely justified. Comparatively few of the staff are sufficiently familiar with the requirements for the degree to make them safe guides for their advisees. Many a student has been seriously embarrassed either by the failure to receive correct advice or by receiving positively erroneous directions from his adviser. In fact, the business of getting a degree in many cases is a very delicate matter involving a knowledge of certain twists and turns in the interpretation of the requirements that could scarcely be expected from a member of the staff who has not concerned himself with such matters.

"The second function of the adviser is to be the guide and friend of the student in all kinds of personal questions that may arise. Experience seems to show that no college teacher can be intelligently designated to take this place for an individual student. A man makes his own friends and goes to each of them for the counsel that they can individually give.

"It has therefore been decided to organize a committee of technical experts on the requirements for the degree and to ask each student to obtain from a member of this committee the authorization of his program of studies. At the times when programs are being made in September, January and April this committee may be found in a room near the Registrar's Office and their authorization secured. The students who have been in residence more than one year are no longer assigned to a definite personal adviser, but are placed on their

own responsibility to obtain advice from those whose advice they value. Each freshman, however, is assigned specifically to his instructor in Contemporary Civilization whom he meets five times a week and with whom he must needs be on rather intimate terms. This system, supplemented by the work of the Assistants to the Dean for the highly technical advice to the pre-professional students, has given results this year of such a satisfactory character that it will be given further trial."

*Dean Woodbridge.* "Sober reflection, however, does not warrant even the wish to return to methods that have had their day and worn out. But it may raise the question, 'What purpose may faculties serve in a graduate school?' As the subjects for research multiply and their supporting studies vary, as professional schools reach out beyond the training necessary to their immediate task to the scholarly and scientific exploration of the foundations of their arts, as institutes and bureaus of research arise, it seems futile to suppose that a single graduate faculty can be created to comprise the many individuals engaged in so many enterprises. And the creation of many faculties results in the erection of arbitrary barriers which the work of research is constantly tearing down. May it not be, even though our reminiscences are reluctant, that in this matter of research faculties have become the survival of a type of university organization no longer adequate to existing demands? The conviction has grown with the years that a small board or council, similar to the Joint Committee on Graduate Instruction, is a far more competent body to deal with the problem of university research and to frame and administer the requirements for advanced degrees than a single faculty of a hundred or two, or several faculties of fifty each. The problems we have to meet are problems to be solved by inquiry and not by parliamentary discussion and debate. But I neither ask nor expect a revolutionary change. What I ask is the liberal consideration by our colleagues of the direction in which we seem to be moving, the watching and testing of it, and the willingness to try out its effectiveness. For we can make the experiment while yet we hold on to the tradition.

"The really important service which something like faculty organization might render, is the stimulation of the common interests of naturally allied groups of scholars. Obviously, it is research itself, not administration and regulations, that sustains scholarly and scientific enthusiasm. What I conceive we need, in addition to

orderly administration and the adequate support of our work, is the stimulus which would come from more common knowledge of what the University is actually doing. One could wish that our faculties were more like academies—bodies to which the results of investigation could be presented for information and appraisalment. If allied groups of scholars held occasional meetings in which they might learn what their colleagues were doing, much might be done for the advancement of learning. Our busy life is not without illustrations. Departments have their meetings and colloquiums. The conferences at the President's House to discover and form university opinion on important projects have revealed the University to those attending them in new and stimulating ways. The Joint Committee on Graduate Instruction, through a subcommittee with Professor A. H. Thorndike as chairman, is making a survey of the research work of the University which in part should soon be available for common knowledge. Perhaps through such movements as these we are preserving in our academic life that sense of a common enterprise which the old faculty meeting was supposed to promote."

*Secretary Fackenthal.* "Columbia University began to give serious attention to the organization of a student employment office about the year 1900. The work started as a part of the activity of the office of the Secretary of the University, the employment secretary being one of the clerks on the Secretary's staff, and part of his time was given to other than employment work. In 1921 the employment secretary was given an office by himself with independent, though small, appropriations for office expenses. The University's obligations in many other directions made it impossible to support the employment work in a way that made aggressive development possible, but the time seems to have come when a study of the employment and appointment work is desirable in order that serious plans may be made for the future. . .

"The work of the Appointments Office falls into two parts: (1) part-time employment for students seeking to earn some or all of their college expenses, and (2) the placing in permanent positions of graduates, not only of Columbia College but of the several non-professional and professional schools.

"In regard to the former it has been the constant endeavor of the University, whenever possible, to place self-supporting students in positions that continue through the entire academic year and which

will provide the necessary income to meet their college expenses. Many spasmodic and inconsequential calls for help come to the office from employers who have only a few hours' or a few days' employment to offer. Students will sometimes be able to go from one job to another in quick succession, but the anxiety, as well as the expenditure of nervous energy which accompanies this sort of constant change, is a burden which it is our desire to eliminate, as far as possible. If Professor Brissenden's proposal for the appointment of a full-time man of at least Assistant Professor grade were carried into effect, undoubtedly a thorough-going scheme of all-year-'round, or at least seasonal, part-time employment could be worked out. The second part of the appointment's work has been very little developed largely because the time of the staff has been pretty fully occupied in trying to help the self-supporting student. There is a tendency among university appointments offices to feel a responsibility for placing and replacing alumni years after graduation. The Columbia office feels that it has done its full duty if it assists the young graduate in finding his first position. As opportunity presents the office is glad to help alumni to advance themselves but to make that natural desire a principal activity would incur great expense and would seem to lead the University rather far afield.

"In order to be really effective in the part-time employment or in permanent placement work a scheme of rigid discipline is indispensable. It is of utmost importance to make students understand clearly that if the University is to accomplish anything in the way of employment work, they carry a heavy responsibility for cooperation and fair dealing. It is not uncommon for students who apply for help to ignore or delay in following up opportunities brought to their attention or to pass the opportunity on to someone else without consulting the Employment Office. There is also a tendency on the part of students who may have secured a profitable position through the Appointments Office, to fill that position with some friend who may or may not be competent. Employers, too, need some education in regard to matters of this kind."

VASSAR, REPORT OF THE PRESIDENT. *Student Government*.—"No more interesting problem confronts the American College world than that of student self-government. As our knowledge of student conditions increases, the problem naturally widens. We know much more about our students than we have in the past; their conditions

of health, of mental attitude and aptitude, their social ideals are all better known than formerly; we now realize as obligations many tasks which formerly were either ignored or neglected. Much of what was formerly included in the moral sponsorship of student life by colleges has now been referred to sciences dealing with personality. As a result, the problem needs to be restated in the new terms. It is quite certain also that up to the present there has been little differentiation between government intended for men and that for women.

"Our increasing knowledge shows us that in many respects the problems of student government are different in different environments. In co-educational universities it is the exception to find a joint student association of both men and women, and the increasing tendency has been to separate government of women from that of men, because of the different problems involved. We thus consider the problem of student self-government as one phase of the field of government for women, without particular consideration of the problem as it affects men.

"The problem at Vassar College has two main aspects—the desire of the students for greater authority over their own actions while residents in a college community, and the measures of control adopted by the students to maintain such authority as has been granted. These two phases of the problem are closely related, and indeed the cooperation of the Faculty in furtherance of student petitions in the one field has been absolutely dependent upon success in the other, for it seems axiomatic that students can be trusted with authority over their own actions only in proportion as they successfully maintain the laws which they accept for their own social behavior. . .

"To a much greater degree than formerly, students in American colleges are in touch with current life; the number of speakers dealing with contemporary social and political problems has increased; student associations are affiliated with many organizations powerful in modern social life; the social sciences are taught more than ever, with attention to modern problems. The annual reports of heads of departments of history and economics bring this out very clearly; the number of courses in contemporary history and of educational projects in the economic courses indicates how far the student of today is from the student of yesterday whose chief concern was with the past.

"The restlessness of the American college student is then an echo of the restlessness in the world at large. Her social point of view is



brought to the college from an environment which finds itself divided into two opposing camps upon the question of law and its right to control the personal behavior of the individual. While the majority of the students look forward eagerly to participation in the social life of the colleges, there is always an element in the student body of those who go to college primarily for the development of their own individuality and who definitely refuse the social responsibilities of the new environment. These students often comprise the most intelligent and most serious, and sometimes the most mature members of the student body. . .

"We are also confronting in 1924 the effect of a generation educated in self-expression. We have now in college students who have grown up under a system which has believed with Professor Dewey that the chief end of school is to make children enjoy it; that children should be educated primarily on the basis of play, freedom, individuality, and initiative. These students have been trained under a system which has centered their attention not upon the world in which they live and their obligation to it, but upon their own capabilities and how they can exercise them. They have been taught that 'knowledge that is worthy of being called knowledge is obtained only by participating intimately and actively in activities of social life.' Yet, while we have these products of the new education with us we have not as yet the data on which to judge the experiment. From the academic point of view the situation is more clear. Our teachers testify in all departments of study that students of today are rather more serious and rather better trained than they ever were. . .

"But from the point of view of social behavior and of self-government, the evidence is increasing that the new education needs to take into consideration more fully the responsibility of the individual to his group and the necessary limitations upon free development which he must undergo for the sake of the higher advantages that he desires. Apostles of the new individualism and of the new education have minimized the importance of the teacher in the student's life; they have urged him, so far as possible, to do without teachers; instead of emphasizing the essential unity of the position of teacher and student, in that both are at the same time teaching and learning with a common goal and common interest. The tendency has frequently sprung up to emphasize the disparity in these relations and thus to remove from the student that trust in the expert knowl-

edge both of his field and experience, which the teacher may be presumed to have if age and study are to count for anything. . .

"When the system of student self-government was first initiated, it was based upon the principle of honor of the group: students undertook in view of freedom from Faculty supervision, to control by reporting and punishing those of their own body who violated what were accepted as college laws. Recently increasing individualism was seen in the release by the Students' Association of its members from any obligation to report violations which they see. The students have not so far solved the dilemma thus created; it is obvious that no system of government is worthy the name in which offenders are not brought up; college government based on the merely educative value of public opinion is an ideally pure anarchy for which the college of today is not ready. On the other hand, the failure to meet this problem fully, engenders increasing discontent with that part of the regulations which are still in the hands of the college administration and which, therefore, are more fully enforced. The students' associations therefore seek to meet this discontent by taking over the college administration without providing any machinery for its enforcement. This means a still further disintegration of the sense of social obligation.

"Such government as is exercised today by college students unaided by the Faculty is paradoxically enough a reversion to an absolute system of penology. To settle the cases of offenders without reference to experts is to take a backward step in the history of discipline students who pass hasty acts of punishment of offenders against their laws, without considering the physical and mental problems involved, are apt to be unjust to the individual. The recent history of other colleges has proved the unwisdom of granting to students such complete authority, and it is almost universal in American colleges today that the college administration must assume full responsibility for the acts of student government. The theory of a student government entirely independent of Faculty advice runs also counter to the new education as applied to the college.

"It is, indeed, a question whether the new education has not developed a sense of personal freedom from responsibility earlier in life than did the older type of education, and whether there is not too in the student of maturity of today something almost childish in the theory that they are responsible to each other for their acts. The older students especially, and those who in their junior and sophomore

years have had some contact with university foreign life, are apt to adopt this attitude. It is increasingly evident, whatever be the development of social government at Vassar, that the rules of the future will not be written out in so great detail as they are at present, and that there will develop instead of the written law a common law based upon common sense. . .

"On the whole, it may be said that wherever the intellectual interests of Faculty and students coincide there is the most perfect cooperation today, and the difficulties that exist are wholly in the part of the life of the student which seems independent of association with the Faculty. . .

"The new constitution of the Students' Association just adopted, which has been approved by the Faculty, while it does not meet the problem of individual responsibility fully, is nevertheless an attempt to correct the indifference of the average student to student government through a system of representation. The legislature which will hereafter enact the rules of government will, theoretically at least, be composed of students who are interested in the problem, and not of members whose interest is only comparatively faint. The administration of discipline is transferred to a group whose primary interest should lie in this field, and not, as formerly, to officers of student government already overburdened with administrative duties. The Faculty, in approving the new student constitution, have substituted for the old grant of powers, which was a somewhat complicated document, a reaffirmation of the principle of cooperation, always recognized at Vassar. The joint committee is reconstituted and enlarged to consist of eighteen members, and to sit as a conference council with only advisory powers. Students are granted that extension of authority over social regulations which they desire, with the exception that the Faculty and the Wardens or other administrative officers may insist upon the right of approval of such steps as in their opinion are radical departures from current custom. Final authority in actions such as suspension or expulsion is reserved, as at present under Trustee regulation, to the President of the college. The whole action on the Judiciary is referred for further study to this newly-constituted Joint Committee.

"But while the Faculty of Vassar College still retains final authority in social government, it has welcomed, on the other hand, the entrance of the students, through their curriculum committee, into the field of control of the intellectual life of the college. Both through formal

and informal conference this committee has become something of power in the academic life, and if the future membership is as awake to its opportunities as the present membership has been, its prestige should rapidly make it an essential part of the educational structure. In adopting the principle of conference, the administration intends to carry it out in the educational as well as in the social field at Vassar.

"It is difficult to compare the degree of freedom which will be embraced in this instrument with that which obtains in other colleges, since the personal equation always enters into such matters. Some students' associations at other colleges have great freedom on paper which in practice does not obtain; others have much greater freedom than the limited scope of their printed statement would suggest. It is quite clear that at Vassar College true freedom will come only with a corresponding exercise of self-control; that the Faculty have by no means consigned their obligations as educational officers to the student body; and that if the principle of conference be fully and frankly accepted, the way to freedom lies in the cooperation thus developed."

H. N. MACCRACKEN

## LOCAL AND CHAPTER NOTES

COLORADO SCHOOL OF MINES.—It is announced that the presidency will be vacant from, and after, September 21, 1925. It is further stated that Dr. Alderson has expressed his intention "to cooperate with the board to carry on his work as president to the end of his term with the same undivided loyalty and enthusiasm that he has heretofore shown." It will be recalled that an investigation at this institution was published in the *Bulletin* for April, 1920.

DARTMOUTH. *Fraternity Pledging*.—Early in December, President Hopkins sent to the president of the fraternity council the following letter.

Dear Mr. Reading:

The interpolation of fraternity interests into the freshman year at Dartmouth is a maladjustment. Its processes are harmful to the class, demeaning to the fraternities, and injurious to the morale of the College.

The increasing seriousness of the situation during recent years has been largely due to what in many ways has been a desirable development—namely, an increasing number of chapters. Coincident with this, nevertheless, the tendency remains among most of the fraternities, old and new, to establish contacts with men of a common type and to judge fraternity success by the number of men of this kind who are eventually pledged. These men aggregate a relatively small group as compared with the number of fraternities which seek their attention. The original impact and the continued pressure of the system annually creates discomfort for many and misfortune for some among those most sought by the fraternities.

The present rushing and pledging system is bad in its unnatural formalities and in its artificial complexity. It is even more an injury in its tendencies to monopolize time and to distract attention among men subject to it—time needful to many of these men if they are to qualify in their college work.

In so far as the judgment of the respective fraternities is good in determining who are the outstanding men of the freshman class, the system works as an almost infallible procedure for making the college course difficult for these men. Meanwhile, to the extent to which the judgment of the fraternities concerning men proves fallacious, and to the further extent to which many a man fails to find due satis-



faction within the fraternity of his hurried choice, responsibility can be ascribed to the insufficient time and opportunity for mutual acquaintanceship which is involved.

I am quite clear in my own mind that both the men of the freshman class and the fraternities themselves ought to be protected from the unfortunate workings in the college of today of a system devised for a college of few fraternity chapters and of classes comparatively small.

Finally, those men not enlisted in nor interested in the fraternity life of the College have right to protection against the disorganization of college work as a whole incident to the present system.

Therefore, after the close of the present academic year, no fraternity will be permitted either to initiate or to pledge a man to membership until he shall have attained sophomore standing and only after the beginning of the man's sophomore year within the College. To such extent as may be necessary, regulations will be established to enforce this ruling.

It is not my wish to have the College go farther in official action than may prove necessary because of the unwillingness or the inability of the Interfraternity Council to adopt and to enforce measures to support such a method as outlined. I include in this the avoidance by the fraternities collectively and individually of anything in the nature of an attempt to encourage organization of freshman societies.

If I were to suggest further what the desirable procedure should be, I would unhesitatingly recommend the elimination of all formal and arbitrary rules restricting natural contacts between upper classmen and freshmen and the common adoption among the fraternities of a date as early as possible subsequent to the opening of the sophomore year for the pledging of new members.

In order that there may be full understanding among men of the College at the earliest possible time in regard to the insistence of this letter, I am sending a copy of it to "The Dartmouth" for such publicity as may seem desirable to it.

I am

Yours very truly,

(Signed) ERNEST MARTIN HOPKINS

UNIVERSITY OF MARYLAND.—The University has successfully defended a law suit brought by the father of a woman student to prevent her dismissal from the university on account of persistent breaches of

discipline. The judgment in the lower court was initially in favor of the student, but this was reversed by the Court of Appeals at the October term, the decision being published in the *Daily Record* of Saturday, December 13.

MICHIGAN. *Requirements for Appointment and Promotion of Members of the Faculty.*—"For the first time in the history of universities specific academic qualifications necessary for the appointment and promotion of members of the faculty of the University of Michigan have been formulated by the president of the university, and were adopted recently by the university senate. This plan will be formally accepted at the next meeting of the board of regents.

"An instructor, under the new plan, must have taken graduate work, or have had professional experience, presumably the doctorate or its equivalent. He must show evident teaching ability and must have demonstrated ability to do research work under guidance.

"A new position has been created on the faculty staff, that of a junior instructorship, the requirements for which demand a substantial knowledge of the subject as evidenced by his collegiate record, a definite promise of teaching ability and a distinct interest in scholarship and research.

"An assistant professor will be required to demonstrate ability as a teacher, scholar or independent investigator, or to have had valuable professional experience.

"The general requirements for the professors and associate professors under the new plan demand that the candidate must have been engaged in original scholarship, and must have an established reputation as a teacher. He will be expected to have contributed to an authoritative journal, or to have prepared a treatise or textbook of acknowledged value.

"The specific qualification for the associate professorship is that the candidate's record for scholarship should be well established; for the professorship, the record for original scholarship should be sufficient to give at least national reputation within the profession.

"In case the candidate falls short in any requirements as set forth in the plan, higher standing will be required in other qualifications. For promotion, the requirements, as outlined, will be used as a basis."

NORTHWESTERN.—The *Alumni News* for December, 1924, contains a comprehensive outline of a survey for the different divisions

of the institution. The committee appointed by the president includes Dean Kent of the College of Liberal Arts as chairman; Dean Wigmore of the School of Law; Director Hayford of the School of Engineering; Dean Kendall of the School of Medicine; Dean Heilman of the School of Commerce. The purpose of the study is defined as follows: (1) To define the primary objectives of Northwestern University in each of its schools, and as a University, including contribution to public welfare. (2) To make as reliable a judgment as possible upon how well Northwestern University, through its several schools, is at present achieving the results which it should achieve. (3) To discover and make recommendations concerning what Northwestern needs in order to achieve the desired results. Matters to be included in the study are physical equipment, objectives and standards of research and teaching, organization and administration of instruction, entrance requirements, courses of study and requirements for degrees, standards and measurements of student attainment, opportunities for research, comparative achievement of graduates, student personnel, student life, accounting, budget, scholarships and fellowships, contribution to public welfare. The survey is to be made by a commission for each school, including one faculty member, one outside specialist, one alumnus, one member of another faculty, with possible additions; all to be appointed by the president. The board of trustees is invited to appoint a member for each school.

UNIVERSITY OF WASHINGTON.—*A Letter from a Chapter Officer.* "I had thought of framing a letter of invitation but on reading again the little printed circular on general information I find that it contains practically all that a special letter could contain, so I am of the opinion that it would be sufficient to frame a very short letter of invitation and enclose one of the circulars together with an application card. Assuming that the national officers will welcome any increase in membership in the local chapters, I am asking you to supply me with about 100 printed circulars and an equal number of application cards.

"I may say that there has been an unusual interest in the work of the local chapter, largely due to the fact, I think, that we have arranged for regular meetings for the discussion of problems of current interest."

## COMMITTEES FOR 1925

### Executive Committee of the Council

*Chairman, A. O. Leuschner (Astron.), California*

F. C. Babbitt (Greek), Trinity; Mary W. Calkins (Philos.), Wellesley; E. R. A. Seligman (Pol. Sci.), Columbia; W. T. Semple (Latin), Cincinnati; H. W. Tyler (Math.), Mass. Inst. Tech.; E. H. Wilkins (Rom. Lang.), Chicago.

### Committee to Nominate Officers

*Chairman, L. J. Richardson (Latin), California*

Henry Crew (Physics), Northwestern; G. D. Hancock (Econ.), Washington and Lee; R. H. Keniston (Rom. Lang.), Cornell; W. T. Magruder (Mech. Eng.), Ohio State; H. L. Rietz (Math.), Iowa; Marion P. Whitney (German), Vassar.

### COMMITTEE A

#### Academic Freedom and Tenure

*Chairman, H. F. Goodrich (Law), Michigan*

*Eastern Group:* F. A. Fetter (Econ.), Princeton; J. P. Lichtenberger (Sociol.), Pennsylvania; A. O. Lovejoy (Philos.), Johns Hopkins; E. S. Thurston (Law), Yale; A. L. Wheeler (Latin), Bryn Mawr.

*The Central Group:* H. M. Bates (Law), Michigan; F. S. Deibler (Econ.), Northwestern; G. L. Roberts (Vocational Education), Purdue; U. G. Weatherly (Sociol.), Indiana; Quincy Wright (Pol. Sci.), Chicago.

*Western Group:* G. P. Adams (Philos.), California; H. R. Fairclough (Latin), Stanford; F. M. Padelford (Eng.), Washington (Seattle); R. C. Tolman (Chem.), Calif. Inst. Tech.; H. B. Torrey (Biol.), Oregon.

### COMMITTEE F

#### Admission of Members

*Acting Chairman, Florence Bascom (Geol.), Bryn Mawr*

W. C. Allee (Biology), Chicago; A. L. Bouton (Eng.), New York; J. Q. Dealey (Sociol.), Brown; E. C. Hinsdale (German), Mt. Holyoke;

A. R. Hohlfeld (German), Wisconsin; A. L. Keith (Latin), S. Dakota; G. H. Marx (Engin.), Stanford; F. A. Saunders (Physics), Harvard; F. C. Woodward (Law), Chicago.

## COMMITTEE I

## University Ethics

*Chairman, J. H. Tufts (Philos.), Chicago*

G. P. Costigan, Jr. (Law), California; John Dewey (Philos.), Columbia; W. B. Munro (Pol. Sci.), Harvard; E. A. Ross (Sociol.), Wisconsin; H. C. Warren (Psychol.), Princeton; U. G. Weatherly (Sociol.), Indiana.

## SPECIAL COMMITTEES

## COMMITTEE B

## Methods of Appointment and Promotion

*Chairman, R. C. Flickinger (Classics), Northwestern*

G. E. Barnett (Econ.), Johns Hopkins; J. S. Bassett (History), Smith; R. J. Bonner (Greek), Chicago; Percy Bordwell (Law), Iowa; J. M. Coulter (Botany), Chicago; Clive Day (Econ.), Yale; Max Farrand (History), Yale; G. C. Fiske (Latin), Wisconsin; E. E. Hale (Eng.), Union; V. C. Hill (Classics), Ohio University; F. E. Lumley (Sociol.), Ohio State; W. E. McElfresh (Physics), Williams; Herbert Martin (Philos.), Drake; T. H. Morgan (Zool.), Columbia; W. A. Noyes (Chem.), Illinois; R. M. Wenley (Philos.), Michigan; J. A. Woodburn (History), Indiana.

## COMMITTEE C

## International Relations

*Chairman, E. R. A. Seligman (Pol. Sci.), Columbia*

Edward Capps (Classics), Princeton; John Dewey (Philos.), Columbia; C. H. Haskins (History), Harvard; J. C. Merriam, Carnegie Institution, Washington, D. C.; R. A. Millikan (Physics), Calif. Inst. Tech.; Paul VanDyke (History), Princeton; L. S. Rowe, Pan-American Union, Washington, D. C.; J. H. Wigmore (Law), Northwestern.



COMMITTEE D

Relation of Vocational to General Higher Education

*Chairman, Lucile Eaves (Sociol.), Simmons*

J. M. Brewer (Educ.), Harvard; E. F. Buchner (Educ.), Johns Hopkins; A. M. Cathcart (Law), Stanford; T. de Laguna (Philos.), Bryn Mawr; H. S. Fry (Chem.), Cincinnati; A. B. Hart (History), Harvard; H. H. Higbie (Engin.), Michigan; G. O. James (Astron.), Washington; W. F. Magie (Physics), Princeton; A. F. Payne (Educ.), Columbia; W. B. Pillsbury (Psychol.), Michigan; D. Snedden (Educ.), Columbia; F. C. Woodward (Law), Chicago.

COMMITTEE E

Extent of the Employment of Student Assistants and the Effect on Quality of Undergraduate Instruction and on Graduate Work of the Student Assistants

*Chairman, L. L. Woodruff (Biol.), Yale*

Mary W. Calkins (Philos.), Wellesley; E. H. Cameron (Educ.), Illinois; B. M. Duggar (Botany), Washington (St. Louis); I. Hardesty (Anat.), Tulane; L. M. Hoskins (Engin.), Stanford; D. A. McCabe (Sociol.), Princeton; W. McPherson (Chem.), Ohio State; L. F. Mott (Eng.), City of New York; W. B. Munro (Government), Harvard; S. E. Stout (Latin), Indiana; C. H. Van Tyne (History), Michigan.

COMMITTEE G

Methods of Increasing the Intellectual Interest and Raising the Intellectual Standards of Undergraduates

*Chairman, E. H. Wilkins (Rom. Lang.), Chicago*

H. H. Bender (Philol.), Princeton; J. J. Coss (Philos.), Columbia; R. S. Crane (Eng.), Chicago; Anna A. Cutler (Philos.), Smith; T. H. Dillon (Elec. Engin.), Harvard; C. M. Gayley (Eng.), California; G. R. Havens (Rom. Lang.), Ohio State; Olive C. Hazlett (Math.), Mount Holyoke; G. A. Miller (Math.), Illinois; W. J. Newlin (Philos.), Amherst; James I. Osborne (Eng.), Wabash; A. L. Owen (Span.), Kansas; Ralph B. Perry (Philos.), Harvard; R. K. Root (Eng.), Princeton; G. W. Stewart (Physics), Iowa; J. S. P. Tatlock (Eng.), Stanford; A. C. Trowbridge (Geol.), Iowa; H. V. Wilson (Biol.), North Carolina.

## COMMITTEE H

Desirability and Practicability of Increased Migration and  
Interchange of Graduate Students

*Chairman, A. O. Leuschner (Astron.), California*

A. T. Clay (Philol.), Yale; J. H. Gray (Econ.), Carleton; E. R. Hedrick (Math.), California (So. Br.); F. W. Kelsey (Latin), Michigan; A. W. Meyer (Anat.), Stanford; F. W. Taussig (Econ.), Harvard; J. W. Young (Math.), Dartmouth.

## COMMITTEE J

## College Athletics

*Chairman, T. F. Moran (Hist. and Econ.), Purdue*

Henry Crew (Physics), Northwestern; J. H. Hildebrand (Chem.), California; C. W. Mendell (Latin), Yale; T. A. Storey (Hygiene), City of New York.

## COMMITTEE K

## Systems for Sabbatical Years

*Chairman, F. N. Scott (Rhetoric), Michigan*

C. M. Andrews (History), Yale; O. J. Campbell (Eng.), Michigan; Margaret C. Ferguson (Botany), Wellesley; Tenney Frank (Latin), Johns Hopkins; J. W. Garner (Pol. Sci.), Illinois; J. Jastrow (Psychol.), Wisconsin; A. C. Lanier (Engin.), Missouri; Ernest Merritt (Physics), Cornell; J. B. Pratt (Philos.), Williams; O. E. Randall (Mech.), Brown; R. M. Wenley (Philos.), Michigan; Frederick Slocum (Astron.), Wesleyan.

## COMMITTEE L

Cooperation with Latin-American Universities to Promote Exchange  
Professorships and Fellowships, etc.

*Chairman, L. S. Rowe (Director-General, Pan-American Union), Washington*

S. I. Bailey (Astron.), Harvard; E. E. Brandon (Rom. Lang.), Miami; Philip M. Brown (Int. Law), Princeton; S. P. Capen,\* Chancellor, University of Buffalo; A. C. Coolidge (History), Harvard; S. P. Duggan (Educ.), City of New York; A. C. Flick (History), (State Historian Office), Albany, N. Y.; J. D. M. Ford (Rom. Lang.),

Harvard; Peter H. Goldsmith\* (Director, Amer. Assoc. for International Conciliation), New York; E. C. Hills (Rom. Lang.), California; J. H. Hollander (Econ.), Johns Hopkins; Wm. J. Hussey (Astron.), Michigan; Julius Kline,\* Department of Commerce, Washington, D. C.; C. C. Marden (Span.), Princeton; C. C. Plehn (Econ.), California; E. A. Ross (Sociol.), Wisconsin; Arthur R. Seymour (Rom. Lang.), Illinois; G. H. Stuart (Pol. Sci.), Stanford; Glen L. Swiggett\* (Rom. Lang.), Washington, D. C.; Raymond Weeks (Rom. Lang.), Columbia.

## COMMITTEE M

## Freedom of Teaching in Science

*Chairman, S. J. Holmes (Zoology), California*

Joseph Allen (Math.), New York City; J. H. Breasted (Oriental Lang.), Chicago; G. A. Coe (Psychol.), Columbia; E. G. Conklin (Biology), Princeton; J. V. Denney (Eng.), Ohio State; John Dewey (Philos.), Columbia; R. F. Griggs (Botany), George Washington; Vernon Kellogg, National Research Council; Shailer Mathews (Theo.), Chicago; R. A. Millikan (Physics), Calif. Inst. Tech.; E. C. Moore (Theo.), Harvard; Herbert Osborn (Zool.), Ohio State; W. Patten (Biol.), Dartmouth; A. H. Turner (Zool.), Mt. Holyoke; H. E. Walter (Biol.) Brown; W. H. Welch (Pathol.), Johns Hopkins.

## COMMITTEE O

## Income Tax Questions

*Chairman, T. S. Adams (Pol. Econ.), Yale*

Alzada Comstock (Econ.), Mt. Holyoke; R. M. Haig (Bus. Organ.), Columbia; E. W. Kemmerer (Econ.), Princeton; C. C. Plehn (Econ.), California.

## COMMITTEE P

## Pensions and Insurance

*Chairman, W. W. Cook (Law), Yale*

S. S. Huebner (Finance), Pennsylvania; E. W. Kemmerer (Econ.), Princeton; H. L. Rietz (Math.), Iowa; W. F. Wilcox (Econ.), Cornell.

\* Associate members:

## COMMITTEE R

## Encouragement of University Research

*Chairman, W. A. Oldfather (Latin), Illinois*

E. C. Armstrong (French), Princeton; C. Becker (History), Cornell; A. C. L. Brown (Celtic), Northwestern; A. R. Hohlfeld (German), Wisconsin; R. G. Kent (Comp. Philol.), Pennsylvania; E. P. Lewis (Physics), California; J. L. Lowes (Eng.), Harvard; W. A. Nitze (Rom. Lang.), Chicago; C. C. Torrey (Oriental Lang.), Yale.

## COMMITTEE T

## Place and Function of Faculties in University Government and Administration

*Chairman, E. E. Hale (English), Union*

J. A. Leighton (Philol.), Ohio State; O. K. McMurray (Jurisprudence), California; Marion P. Whitney (German), Vassar.

## COMMITTEE W

## Status of Women in College and University Faculties

*Chairman, A. Caswell Ellis (Educ.), Texas*

Florence Bascom (Geol.), Bryn Mawr; Cora J. Beckwith (Zool.), Vassar; Harriet W. Bigelow (Astron.), Smith; H. E. Bolton (History), California; Isabelle Bronk (French), Swarthmore; Carleton Brown (Philol.), Bryn Mawr; Caroline Colvin (Latin), Maine; John Dewey (Philos.), Columbia; Anna J. McKeag (Educ.), Wellesley; D. C. Munro (History), Princeton; Louise Pound (Eng.), Nebraska; Louise Stanley (Bureau of Home Economics), Washington, D. C.; Marian Talbot (Dean), Chicago; G. M. Whipple\* (Education), Michigan; W. F. Willcox (Econ.), Cornell; A. B. Wolfe (Econ.), Ohio State.

## COMMITTEE Z

## The Economic Condition of the Profession

*Chairman, C. C. Arbuthnot (Econ.), Western Reserve*

T. N. Carver (Econ.), Harvard; W. W. Cook (Law), Yale; J. Jastrow (Semitic Lang.), Wisconsin; W. T. Semple (Latin), Cincinnati; Alexander Silverman (Chem.), Pittsburgh.

\* Associate member.

## MEMBERSHIP

### MEMBERS ELECTED

The Committee on Admissions announces the election of one hundred and thirty-nine members, as follows:

**Boston University**, G. B. Franklin; **Bucknell University**, W. H. Coleman, N. H. Stewart; **University of California**, Sturla Einarsson, H. M. Jeffers; **University of California, Southern Branch**, C. A. Dykstra, W. J. Kraft; **Carleton College**, H. P. Houghton, G. B. Woods; **University of Chattanooga**, T. P. Abernethy, J. W. Edwards; **University of Colorado**, F. D. Bramhall, W. E. Deming, Russell Gibson, W. J. Hazard, K. F. Muenzinger, J. K. Shriber, Miriam Rieder, Rosetta B. Wolcott, Jacob Van Ek; **Cornell University**, H. M. Morse; **Dartmouth College**, J. D. McCallum; **University of Delaware**, R. E. Saleski; **George Washington University**, G. M. Churchill, A. T. Deibert, John Donaldson, M. I. Protzman; **Goucher College**, Honora English, Elizabeth Merritt, Myrta E. McGinnis; **University of Illinois**, Ethel Bond; **Lafayette College**, C. R. Hart, H. V. Shelley, J. H. Wilson; **Lake Forest College**, Marguerite W. Kehr, Frederick Wood; **University of Louisville**, L. R. Gottschalk; **University of Maine**, N. R. Bryan, Howard Flewelling, Bertha J. Howard, C. C. Janzen, W. S. Lucas, W. S. Taylor; **Mt. Holyoke College**, L. G. Burgevin, Ruth E. Dyer; **University of Nebraska**, W. C. Brenke, A. L. Candy, G. E. Condra, Clara Conklin, A. R. Congdon, R. P. Crawford, Charles Fordyce, H. H. Foster, E. S. Fullbrook, P. H. Grummann, J. E. Kirchman, O. R. Martin, Marguerite C. McPhee, T. B. Robb, W. E. Sealock, F. A. Stuff; **Oberlin College**, H. N. Holmes, Lynds Jones, C. G. Rogers, L. W. Taylor; **Ohio University**, G. E. Carrothers, G. S. Lasker; **Ohio Wesleyan University**, C. W. Coulter, H. D. LeBaron; **Oklahoma Agriculture and Mechanical College**, A. L. Carlson; **University of Oregon**, M. K. Cameron, D. E. Clark, H. R. Douglass, C. L. Kelly, H. P. Rainey, Ethel I. Sanborn, H. G. Tanner, R. J. Williams; **College of the City of New York**, J. C. Bell, Herbert Holton; **Pennsylvania State College**, A. A. Borland, H. A. Everett, E. B. Forbes, J. A. Fries, J. E. Isenberg, J. B. Shaw, W. L. Werner; **Pomona College**, G. S. Burgess, W. A. Hilton; **Princeton University**, H. S. Langfeld, J. Q. Stewart; **University of Redlands**, B. E. Ebel; **Reed College**, V. L. O. Chittick; **Rockford College**, H. M. Herrick; **University of Southern**



California, A. F. Blanks, H. G. Duncan, R. T. Flewelling, A. C. Life, D. V. Steed, F. C. Touton, M. J. Vincent, E. F. Young; South Dakota State College, H. M. Crothers, C. R. Wiseman; University of South Dakota, J. C. Tjaden; St. Olaf College, M. A. Nordgaard, Sever Klaragard; Syracuse University, Vasil Obreshkove; Temple University, J. H. Dunham, Marion Mackenzie; University of Toledo, J. B. Brandebury, W. F. Brown, O. G. Jones, F. J. Pavlicek, J. L. Richmond, Ruby T. Scott, G. E. Van Sickle, B. B. Weatherby, I. F. Zarobsky; Tufts College, J. A. C. F. Auer; University of Washington, J. A. O. Larsen; Washington and Jefferson College, R. A. Preston; Wellesley College, Ada M. Coe, Mabel L. Cummings; Wesleyan University, H. C. Bingham, J. E. Cavelti, E. P. Chase, W. E. Greenleaf, C. Kruse, L. W. Lancaster, W. E. Peck, G. E. Raynor, K. S. Van Dyke; College of William and Mary, A. G. Ryland; University of Wisconsin, M. C. Otto; University of Wyoming, Rosa Colegrove, Aven Nelson, E. B. Payson, G. H. Sechrist.

## NOMINATIONS FOR MEMBERSHIP

The following sixty-six nominations are printed as provided under Article IV of the Constitution. Objection to any nominee may be addressed to the Secretary, H. W. Tyler, Cambridge, Mass., or to the Chairman of the Committee on Admissions<sup>1</sup> and will be considered by the Committee if received before May 15, 1925.

The Committee on Admissions consists of Florence Bascom (Bryn Mawr), Acting Chairman, J. Q. Dealey (Brown), A. R. Hohlfeld (Wisconsin), A. L. Keith (South Dakota), G. H. Marx (Stanford), F. A. Saunders (Harvard), and F. C. Woodward (Chicago).

R. D. Anthony (Horticulture), Pennsylvania State  
Louise C. Baker (Modern Languages), Lawrence  
W. G. Bateman (Chemistry), Montana  
Ralph Mason Blake (Philosophy), Washington (Seattle)  
Ralph P. Boas (English), Mount Holyoke  
E. R. Bossange (Architecture), Princeton  
G. W. Botteron (Chemistry), South Dakota State  
Henry L. Brakel (Physics), Washington (Seattle)  
Edward V. Brewer (German), California  
Blanche Brotherton (Latin), Mount Holyoke  
Gottlob C. Cast (Modern Languages), Lawrence  
Sherman D. Chambers (Applied Mechanics), Purdue  
Serenio B. Clark (Classical Languages), Washington (Seattle)  
Teresa Cohen (Mathematics), Pennsylvania State  
Ross W. Collins (History), Syracuse  
Edward G. Cox (English), Washington (Seattle)  
C. S. Cutshall (Applied Mechanics), Purdue  
Grace G. Denny (Home Economics), Washington (Seattle)  
E. O. Eckelman (German), Washington (Seattle)  
Pennoyer F. English (Biology), Saint Teresa  
Roy Gittinger (History), Oklahoma  
S. H. Graf (Mechanics), Oregon State  
Grace M. Griffin (Physics), West Virginia  
June P. Guild (Sociology), Toledo  
Edwin R. Guthrie (Psychology), Washington (Seattle)  
Joseph B. Harrison (English), Washington (Seattle)  
Joseph N. Haskell (German), Boston  
Earl K. Hillbrand (Education), Dakota Wesleyan

<sup>1</sup> Nominations should in all cases be presented through the Secretary, H. W. Tyler, 222 Charles River Road, Cambridge, Mass.

Rachel E. Hoffstadl (Bacteriology), Washington (Seattle)  
Alice Hughes (Education), Toledo  
Carolyn P. Jacobi (Education), Toledo  
Samuel H. Jameson (Sociology), Lafayette  
Clarence R. Johnson (Sociology), Bucknell.  
C. W. Johnson (Pharmacy), Washington (Seattle)  
Robert William Jones (Journalism), Washington (Seattle)  
William T. Laprode (History), Duke  
Hugh S. Lowther (Latin), Occidental  
Helen M. McAlpine (Modern Languages), Purdue  
David F. McFarland (Metallurgy), Pennsylvania State  
Warren B. Mack (Horticulture), Pennsylvania State  
William E. McPheeters (English), Lawrence  
Werner C. Michel (German), West Virginia  
James L. Mussell (Education), Lawrence  
Wilson S. Naylor (Biblical Literature), Lawrence  
F. W. Orr (Public Speaking), Lawrence  
Virginia C. Patty (Home Economics), Washington (Seattle)  
Walter R. Peabody (Economics), Rutgers  
H. F. Rall (Theology), Northwestern  
Edward E. Richardson (Philosophy), George Washington  
Elizabeth J. Rutherford (Psychology), Goucher  
W. B. Sanders (Applied Mechanics), Purdue  
William P. Sanford (English), Ohio State  
Primitivo R. Sanjurjo (Romance Languages), Washington (Seattle)  
M. Louise Sawyer (Botany), Wellesley  
Waldo Schumacher (Political Science), Syracuse  
William R. Sherman (Economics), De Pauw  
Gilbert B. L. Smith (Chemistry), St. John's  
Stevenson Smith (Psychology), Washington (Seattle)  
Laetitia M. Snow (Botany), Wellesley  
Earl Bennett South (Psychology), Ohio University  
Leslie Spier (Anthropology), Washington (Seattle)  
Arward Starbuck (English), Iowa State  
Herman V. Tartar (Chemistry), Washington (Seattle)  
Arthur H. Weston (Classics), Lawrence  
Walter B. Whittlesey (Romance Languages), Washington (Seattle)  
Howard H. Wikel (Modern Languages), Purdue